The Forum

JANUARY, 1897.

POPE LEO XIII.

I ACCEPT with pleasure the invitation of THE FORUM to speak to Americans of that European whose thoughts are most engrossed by America. This man is unquestionably Pope Leo XIII.

From my interviews with the venerable Pontiff I have always carried away the impression that the New World, and particularly that part of it populated by the Anglo-Saxon race, was the pole toward which the meditations, calculations, and hopes of this intuitive genius were in preference directed. This fact is in itself sufficient to stamp him with a characteristic individuality in the long line of the successors of St. Peter.

At an advanced age, when the generality of men withdraw to contemplations of the inner life and recollections of the past, Leo XIII becomes indeed the typical Pope; that is to say, the individual—unique in the world—who, by virtue of his office, is placed in some degree beyond the limitations of time and space, and whose mind, guided by an active solicitude, is ever circling the universe, seeking the most favorable centres for that light which it is his mission to keep bright. This tendency is the more remarkable as being manifested in a recluse who, imprisoned by unfavorable circumstances between the ancient walls of the Vatican, is obliged to overcome a thousand material difficulties in order to keep in permanent contact with all the races, all the forms of intellect, all the new problems, which are the product of our times.

Copyright, 1896, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to re-publish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

My friend Paul Bourget defines the American as "a man who invariably uses the newest method." This is also the dominant trait in the character of Leo XIII. Within the measure permitted him by a heavy chain of traditions, he does not hesitate to grasp the most modern weapons in defence of his ancient faith; and this deliberate boldness explains his *penchant* for the American character. Yet in those very innovations which most alarm his timid advisers he is conscious of being far less an innovator than a restorer of forgotten tradition. He relies upon the examples set by the great Popes of the Middle Ages, who, in their day, came down to the market-place, stirred the crowds, and led the people on to new horizons.

In the course of later centuries, since the consolidation of the great European monarchies, and during the revolutionary disturbances which followed the decay of these monarchies, a series of Pontiffs restricted the political and social rôle of the Papacy; some of them going so far as to make of it a simple Italian *cabinet d'affaires*. Leo XIII has revived the vast ambitions and the bold procedures of a Gregory VII, of an Innocent III. Like them, with an action broad and resolute, he has cast the Fisherman's net over democracies beyond the seas. The originality of this genius and the most interesting trait for the historian lie in the fact that he should have found in the Middle Ages the secret of an intimate relation with the modern spirit; of an impulse to contemporary Catholicism.

I will endeavor to trace briefly, but with perfect freedom, the successive developments of this lofty genius, and the corresponding increase in the prestige and moral power of the Papacy throughout the world.

Some pious souls love to picture the Holy Father as a lamp which, by virtue of divine inspiration, has always shone with an equal brilliancy. Historical research does not justify this view. An individual, be he even a Pope, is subject to the influences of his environment, passes through inward transformations, and arrives but slowly at the full manifestation of those qualities which he possessed in the germ. Cardinal Joachim Pecci, the descendant of a noble family of the Roman Campagna, held, in his thirty-third year, a diplomatic mission to Belgium. This short embassy to Brussels constituted his single contact with the outside world, his one practical initiation into European affairs. Appointed in 1846 to the bishopric of Perugia, he isolated himself in that tranquil and studious solitude for a period of thirty-two years. Like many other great men, he had his long seclusion in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the wilderness,—a time of earnest and silent preparation for future activity. Forgotten in the shadow of the episcopal palace of Perugia, this austere priest there studied with avidity the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas. In the "Summa" of the philosopher who has accomplished for the Christian world what Aristotle did for the pagan,—giving it a code at once religious, intellectual, and social,—Pecci sought the solutions forever applicable to the needs of the human intellect. His labors won for him the reputation of a sound theologian and a good administrator; and this unobtrusive renown, which did not reach the ears of the profane, secured for him, after the death of Pius IX in 1878, a majority of votes in the Conclave. I was at that time passing through Rome, and was able to be present at the exaltation of the new Pontiff in the Sistine Chapel. The ceremony was thrilling and solemn; but as a rite of the Catacombs, celebrated by shadows in the midst of shadows, far from the world of the living. In the narrow enclosure peopled by the characters of Michelangelo,—figures so full of life and energy that they gave greater emphasis to the weakness of the creatures of flesh and bone,—the aged men of the Sacred College pressed around the sexagenarian whom they were raising to the *sedia gestatoria*. They observed to the best of their ability the pompous etiquette prescribed so many centuries ago; but, in this dark and tiny chapel, their actions seemed but an awkward imitation of the pageantry of former days, when the *cortéges* traversed the imposing and luminous distances of St. Peter's. And, in lieu of the people who formerly proclaimed their new king in St. Peter's, only a few spectators were to be seen scattered in the background of the Sistine Chapel,—the last faithful families of the Roman nobility, some stranger pilgrims of high rank, together with reporters and draughtsmen who sketched with indifference the singular scene for their respective papers. Everything spoke of dead grandeur and a frozen survival; nothing of quickened power or the hope of renewal.

The lengthy reign of Pius IX appeared to have drained the Papacy of its final energies. This Pope had endeavored to play a political rôle in the reconstitution of Italy; and, his liberal concessions resulting only in his dispossession, the disabused Pontiff had levelled at modern society warnings which sounded like anathemas. He had imprinted upon Catholicism a spirit of uncompromising mysticism, of surly opposition to every idea of the age. Silently his light had gone out in a city where the young royalty had noisily established itself; in a transformed Italy to which the Vatican was nothing more than an art

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

museum, sheltering a troublesome prisoner; in a world passionately fond of problems to which the Church appeared either hostile or indifferent.

It was the unanimous opinion of Catholics that the loss of temporal power condemned the Pope to absolute political impotency, and to a religious activity of little moment. The successor of Pius IX, ascending the pontifical throne at an age when one is generally more fitted to complete than to inaugurate, presented the appearance of a saintly man who would but feebly trim the sanctuary lamp whilst waiting for better days. At the brief formal audience which he gave to a few Frenchmen on the eve of his coronation, Leo XIII impressed me as a typical monk; pleasing by the exquisite smile of his race, and imposing through that air of nobility which a serious and dignified life had stamped upon his entire person. But this monk who expressed himself with difficulty in a forgotten language,—could he have issued from his cell for any other purpose than to throw the lean and lofty silhouette of an ascetic into the historic gallery of pontifical portraits? It was doubtless due to our lack of discernment that nothing in his personality revealed a man born to mould and lead the world. In fact during the early years of his pontificate he was ignored by all outside his ecclesiastical environment. He reflected; he studied the age on which he was entering, and the multiplicity of affairs of which he had charge; he dealt tactfully with changes. Only those engaged in the internal government of the Church could appreciate his administrative qualities, the laborious vigilance of his mind, the prudence with which he persevered in his determined struggle against the civil authorities of the kingdom. Little by little the growing troubles of the royal power drew attention to the skill of an adversary who profited by every error without committing a single fault himself. It was felt that he played his game with ability; but it was one purely Italian, and possessed little interest for foreigners, who considered it already lost. The restoration of the temporal power of the Papacy seemed but an idle dream. Meanwhile, the chessboard of this party was daily enlarged, and soon extended beyond the frontiers of the kingdom. Strong in his absolute moral authority and in the affection and discipline of the Catholic parties in all the countries of Europe, Leo XIII opened negotiations with the various governments and compelled the attention of their sovereigns, from whom he drew many concessions. His solicitous care embraced the affairs of all Christendom, in the East as in the West. It was realized more and more that they were controlled by an unparalleled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will together with a remarkable breadth of view. But it still seemed as if one question dominated every other; and that the hidden source of the pontifical activity rested in the hope of a speedy reëstablishment of the temporal power.

This was the period during which Bismarck exercised an undisputed hegemony over European nations: the German Chancellor became the objective point of Vatican diplomacy. Bismarck had need of the Pope to reduce the opposition of the Catholic party in the Reichstag; and he had equal need of him as a scarecrow to render the kingdom of Italy subservient to his designs. An interchange of friendly relations took place between the Protestant Chancellor and the Head of the Catholic Church. In Rome it seemed as if the question of the temporal power were to reach a new awakening. But it was a dangerous game: these coquetries with Germany vexed Italian sentiment, and served especially to disaffect the principal Catholic nation,—France. The play was tempting. The respect which Bismarck paraded evoked corresponding sentiment from the highest personages in Europe: public curiosity was profoundly interested in this sovereign without a kingdom, who negotiated on equal footing with the statesman who was master of the destinies of Europe. Leo XIII was recognized as a great politician, a successor of Sixtus V, a continuator of those ecclesiastics who during four centuries had given to kings and cabinets lessons in superior diplomacy.

At this period (1887) I made another visit to Rome. The changes which I found were very striking. The most prominent feature was the feeble old man whom I had met nine years before. His figure loomed higher each day upon the horizon of the Eternal City. Immediately upon their arrival visitors of distinction rushed to the Vatican to solicit audiences. Now, not only devout pilgrims came to have a chaplet blessed, but people of every creed and notorious unbelievers, the guardians of European interests, monarchs, princes, ministers, ambassadors, publicists,—all were anxious to hear that voice which had already found a universal echo. All the diplomatic negotiations between the Powers had their ramifications at the *Secrétairerie d'État:* the arbitration of the Pope was asked in international differences; he intervened to facilitate reconciliation and a good understanding. Leo XIII had taken rank among the great politicians; but as yet that was all. He was, however, to become more than that.

Whilst preponderating influences surged about him, with the single thought of obtaining the restoration of temporal power through cab-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inet intrigues, his ripened genius comprehended that this was but a deceptive mirage. He perceived the danger of entanglements in which he might be compromised with a monarchy, a system, or a minister, that a crisis might sweep away to-morrow. From successes which might well have intoxicated him, he carried away the single lesson that the power of the Papacy no longer required territorial support in order to play a great rôle, perhaps the greatest rôle, in the universe.

The modern world lends itself to the formation of ideal forces,—forces of public opinion, of credit, so to speak; for these are all born of that evolution which has transferred the wealth of an ingot of gold to a scrap of paper. The great international banks, the vast federations of labor, the press, hold, in varying degrees, an amount of political power equal to that held two centuries ago by certain principalities and secondary kingdoms. Of these forces, the Church is the strongest; all the stronger from the fact that she keeps her independence unimpaired. The groundwork and safeguard of the Holy See lie in the hearts of the Catholic people, in the involuntary respect of non-Catholics. What could the possession of a clod of earth add to it in these days, when government by a few priests would not be tolerated, when the pontifical garrison could only oppose a ridiculous defence against the numerous armies of the neighboring states?

At the same time that Leo XIII discerned the secret of his power, he discovered also the best use for it. Democracy surged about him like an irresistible flood; submerging in France the remnants of monarchical rule, and slowly undermining it in countries where it still existed. Everywhere popular opinion was becoming sovereign mistress; everywhere social questions were taking precedence of political questions. Was there not for this Pontiff, erased from the roll of kings, an immense part to resume,—a part identical with that of his illustrious predecessors of the Middle Ages? To regain the confidence of the people, hostile to the Church since she had identified her interests with those of thrones; to group together the unguided masses, espousing their legitimate aspirations, and imposing a bridle upon their brutal revolts; to give to democracy a rallying point and the most respectable of patronages,—might not this be for the Papacy ample compensation for the loss of its little temporal kingdom, a means to universal monarchy, a return to those triumphant epochs when a pontifical bull roused nations and deposed their sovereigns, when the Vicar of Christ appealed to his tribunal all the great causes of oppressed humanity?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this same winter of 1887, an event occurred which, though of apparently secondary importance, was destined to produce incalculable consequences. The American prelates, Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, arrived in Rome to defend the rights of the Knights of Labor. The ideas they brought astonished and scandalized the venerable dignitaries of the Sacred College: it might be said that the all too bracing air of the Atlantic still clinging to the garments of the travellers made those aged Italians gasp. The Pope alone was unamazed: he understood this adaptation of Catholicism to a society free and democratic. Perhaps he was already meditating on the vanity of those diplomatic successes which had aroused the extravagant expectations of his *entourage*. A study of the transformations in Europe, and his own natural bent, inclined him toward the popular cause. The powerful doctrine of his master, St. Thomas Aquinas, was fermenting in his soul; suggesting that in the ancient Christian wisdom might be found solutions of the social problems of the present day.

There is every reason to suppose that the words of the American prelates supplied the spark which rekindled the flame in this smouldering genius. This, however, is but a psychological induction,—a rash one perhaps,—and I alone am responsible for it. To penetrate the secrets of his private meditations, or to pierce the organic development of his thought, is a privilege Leo XIII has accorded to none. But the facts allow one to say that from this period the characteristics of his pontificate become determined, enlarged, and complete. The able politician becomes above all a great social physician: the crafty diplomatist, who formerly appeared to work for immediate benefits, rises to the masterly conceptions of the historian; his vision embraces centuries, and henceforward he labors for the long future. The claims for temporal power are presented but rarely, and then in such prudent and general terms as to appear merely concessions to habit and to the exigencies of the situation. Leo XIII soon removes the counsellors too deeply engaged in aggressive politics and court intrigues: he desires no other assistant or confidant than Cardinal Rampolla, the faithful servant of his master's mind.

Henceforward the activity of the Pope increases: acts and documents of significance follow one another without intermission. The encyclical on the condition of the working-man brings upon the Holy Father the accusation of socialism; but smilingly he replies that his socialism is very old and perfectly canonical, since the encyclical epitomizes the unadulterated doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas. There are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

encyclicals to the French and American peoples. These treatises, drawn up in traditional form, are completed by more original and familiar manifestations and by interviews accorded to journalists. The aged Cardinals and many of the laity, dumbfounded, veil their faces when the Pope good-humoredly explains his politics to an editor of "Le Petit Journal." To speak directly to the masses, and to draw them to him by every means in his power, was his constant thought, of which he made no secret. The pilgrimages organized by working-men during the Jubilee year were received at the Vatican with the graciousness formerly reserved for the great.

The intentions of the Pope have been nowhere more greatly emphasized than in his discreet and resolute intervention in the affairs of France. The storm he called forth by advising submission to republican institutions is well known. The greater part of the younger clergy submitted to this indication; but a fraction of the older body still resists. The storm is not appeased, nor can it be; since a profound misunderstanding exists between Leo XIII and the Catholic politicians, who charge him with failing to recognize the true interests of religion. These start from false premises. In their eyes the Pope is still the crafty Italian who plays a diplomatic game with the government in power and who expects speedy political returns. He gains nothing; the concessions he makes turn against him; the republican rulers persist in their hostile attitude toward Catholicism; our conservative politicians triumph in this failure. They cannot or will not understand that the Pope cares very little for the government nor expects much from it: their short-sightedness does not grasp the one idea which has dominated the evolution of the Holy Father; namely, to overcome gradually the distrust of the people by favoring those principles to which the people are attached. Leo XIII has entered upon a far-reaching religious and social action; immediate political successes are exacted, and, as these successes are not forthcoming, he is accused of having blundered.

The American public—strangers to the prejudices and passions of the Old World—will not easily conceive the violence of the attacks directed against Leo XIII by the very men who call themselves the accredited defenders of the Church. The Pope stands between two fires: on the one hand, unfeeling abuse from the party in power, who give to irreligion the first place in their programme; and on the other, the sly calumnies of the older parties, who make of religion a weapon to serve their own interests. In this painful struggle, in which, at the be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ginning, he stood almost alone against them all, the Pontiff has proved himself admirable in courage, prudence, and tenacity. When his supporters speak of discouragement, he replies, with an ardent faith, "Look farther ahead!" When the younger men weaken, it is the old man who inspires them with fortitude. Each day brings him some seeming deception; but, never having hoped for immediate victory, he remains unshaken. If you would form an estimate of the commanding figure of Leo XIII, consider the amount of resolution necessary for him to undertake and continue this struggle; think of the overwhelming pressure of his connections, of his *entourage* opposed to any innovations, combining to weigh him down and to maintain him in the rôle until now devolving on the Head of the Church,—the rôle of chaplain of a cemetery, entrusted with the pious care of the political tombs sheltered under the shadow of the sanctuary. Though an octogenarian, the aged athlete has left this burial-ground, to throw himself into the world of the living, to struggle for it with adversaries who imagined it incontestably their own. He has uttered the word of his Master, "Let the dead bury their dead!"

Since his appearance before the masses with the halo of the prophet,—martyr to his convictions and protector of their cause,—Leo XIII has become even greater than before in the sight of all intelligent Europe. This Europe has watched during half a century the disappearance, one by one, of the famous men by whom it has been subjugated, led, or interested. The historical stage is occupied unceasingly by new actors. The Pope alone survives; always active, always in the foreground; like a magnificent pine, isolated, unique of its kind, which rears its haughty head, and attracts attention to the treeless horizon of the Roman hills. The prolongation of every energy in his fragile body far beyond the customary limits of human strength adds somewhat of veneration to the physiognomy of the Pontiff. More than ever the press inquires into everything affecting the Pope: it remarks upon his least word, his slightest action. Those who recall the scornful indifference, until recently, of the secular papers toward all that passed in the little secluded world within the Roman *curie* are much impressed by this evidence of public interest. Each time the press is in want of news it kills the Pope; and a man must possess immense historical vitality, to have the privilege of frequently reading the announcement of his death in the newspapers.

More than ever the stream of visitors of every condition flows to the Vatican; and their stimulated curiosity is well justified by what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they see and hear in this retreat of the oracle. The stranger knocks first at the *portone*,—that wall of bronze which separates the voluntary prisoner from the world. He climbs interminable marble stairs; he traverses galleries peopled with masterpieces of art; everywhere silence, solitude, the overwhelming majesty of great memories and bygone centuries. In mounting these solemn steps the most powerful monarch experiences a sense of personal insignificance; at long intervals he touches lightly in passing silent shadows which have, despite himself, power to expand or limit his authority; he can say, with Goethe's *Egmont*, "I see before me silent and pensive spirits who weigh in shadowy scales the destiny of princes and of peoples."

At the end of the long ascent, in the upper story of the vast palace, in those aërial chambers which embrace a panorama of the Eternal City, a discreet chamberlain conducts the visitor to the *salon d'attente*. Here he finds a truly œcumenic company; men of every race and clime; bishops, missionaries, pilgrims, arrived from the farthest points of Asia, Africa, America, Oceanica. Thanks to these informants, the terrestrial globe accomplishes its revolution daily under the eyes of the recluse who never moves: at every moment he is cognizant of what passes at every point of this earth; he can govern, with a perfect knowledge of events, the scattered multitudes whose souls he holds in the hollow of his hand.

A door opens, giving egress to one of those missionaries who is returning, it may be, to Peru, to China, or to Australia, armed with instructions appropriate to the precise needs of the flock to which he returns. The visitor is admitted in his turn into a small salon draped with yellow silk; a crucifix hangs upon the wall; several chairs are ranged along the two sides of the room; at the back, beneath a canopy of crimson damask, a pale, white form is seated on a gilded chair. It is the embodiment of the spirit which animates all the spiritual governors spread over the planet; which unceasingly follows them to each inquietude, to all the sufferings whose distant plaint reaches his ear. So slight, so frail; like a soul draped in a white shroud! And yet, as one approaches him, this incorporeal being, who appeared so feeble when seen standing at the services in the Sistine Chapel, assumes an extraordinary intensity of existence. All the life has centred in the hands grasping the arms of the chair, in the piercing eyes, in the warmth and strength of the voice. Seated and animated in conversation, Leo XIII seems twenty years younger. He talks freely, easily; he questions the speaker by word and look; eager for details of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country under discussion, of its prominent men, of public opinion. The Pope does not linger over the puerilities of piety; he introduces at once the serious problems of human existence, real and vital interests. Soon he grows animated in developing his favorite topics; presenting them with a few sweeping sentences, clear, concise, acceptable to all. "We must go to the people, conquer the hearts of the people. . . . We must seek the alliance of all honest folk, whatsoever their origin or opinion. . . . We must not lose heart. . . . We will triumph over prejudice, injustice, and error."

It would seem that the mind of the Pope is haunted by several all-absorbing projects. One is the reunion of the Eastern churches, to recall whom to the fold he has made so many paternal advances. Another is the reconciliation of parties in France, and the return of my country, with new political and social forms, to its former position of Christian vanguard. Yet another is the future of the United States, where European civilization assumes new aspects, opens out new paths to humanity and to the Church. A lengthy conversation with Leo XIII leaves the impression of a very broad and clear intelligence, truly Roman in the former sense of the word; of a gently inflexible will persistent in the way it has outlined for itself; of a sincere liberalism which covers no clerical hypocrisy; of a hardy though enlightened faith, respectful of the faith of others; of a heart still warm, free from hatred toward his adversaries, without meannesses, very affectionate toward friendly persons, paternally divided between the nations in his charge beyond his Italy. It is impossible to forget the look, the gesture, the ring of the voice, with which he follows you, as you retire backward, your fingers already grasping the door-knob; the hand extended with a sudden propelling of the whole body from the chair; the inflection of those last words which linger in the ear of the visitor returning to his own land: "Courage! Work! Come back to see me again!" Never a melancholy word; never one of those allusions, so customary in the aged, to the lessening chances of meeting a friend once more. On leaving this man of eighty-eight one carries away a singular impression: it is, that he does not wish to die, so long as there is a battle to fight; that he does not think of death; that he will not die!

Yet one day,—let us hope yet far distant,—the icy breath of the ineluctable will extinguish this brilliant light. What will then happen to the bold advances made by the Church under Leo XIII, and how will they be continued? This question is asked with anxiety by his partisans; by his adversaries with secret joy, for they already discount

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a reactionary policy. I believe the latter deceive themselves in thinking that the choice of a future Conclave can arrest or turn aside the evolution we are witnessing. Such an idea is little in accord with the teachings of history. An irresistible impetus being given, all are carried away; the strong direct its course, the weak submit. Individual opposition is short-lived and has, at the utmost, but the power to impede its progress for a moment. The successor of Leo XIII may not possess the personal prestige of the Pontiff we admire; but to imagine that he will give the Church a direction contrary to that imposed on it by the evolution of nations, and accepted by the select body of the Church, is to suppose a captain steering his vessel backward from his intended destination.

There is still another fear to quiet, a fear which haunts some persons. These perceive the magnificent vistas opened to development for the Papacy by the coincidence of the times and by the initiatory work of Leo XIII, and they fear that a return to theocracy—incompatible with the exigencies of the free modern spirit—will follow a full realization of these dreams. This is to underrate the prudence natural to the Church.

During the Middle Ages and the early dawn of civilization, the constant watchfulness of the Church extended to every detail of daily life; its protection was a defence against the brutalities of feudal powers. But no such conditions exist in our day; and the Church is well aware of the fact. The nations of the world matured, emancipated from ancient traditions by the growth of intellectual faculties, may still claim help and general guidance from the Papacy; but, mistresses henceforth of their policy for good or evil, they reserve to themselves the right to refuse this help and guidance. They no longer need the minute and constant intervention sanctioned by penalties which, correctly speaking, belong to the theocratic system and which may still be useful in dealing with some savage tribes of Africa or Oceanica. But is it necessary to refute objections which common sense instinctively rejects? No mother has yet been found who keeps her grown-up children in leading strings. Joseph de Maistre himself undertook to calm these apprehensions at a time when human liberty did not possess all the guaranties accumulated by our own. In his book "Du Pape" he says: "If they ask me, What will limit the power of the Pope? I will tell them: Everything: canons, laws, national customs, royal powers, great tribunals, national assemblies, inalienable rights, representative bodies, treaties, duty, fear, pru-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dence, and, above all, public opinion, queen of the world." This queen of the world has recognized the breadth of the aims of Leo XIII, especially since the time when his fully matured genius revived the policy of his most illustrious and popular predecessors. Disinterested witnesses, opposed to his views or adhering to other creeds, have with one accord proclaimed him the greatest man of our time.

I have not pretended here to outline all the features of his complex character: I have tried to follow the steady development of his mind. My chief object has been to convey the personal impression made upon me by his gracious welcome. An unbiassed Frenchman cannot leave the Pope without taking with him an affectionate remembrance; and I believe that every American, whatever his opinions or his religion may be, will carry away from the Vatican a like sentiment. I repeat: Since a prejudice and an instinctive inclination have drawn him into the ranks of democracy, Leo XIII, in the depths of his heart, cherishes a special solicitude for France and the United States. A steadfast conviction shows him France as the field where the harvest for the coming summer will ripen; the United States as that in which he is sowing seed for harvests in years to come. He looks upon mysterious America as Noah must have gazed at the peak of Mount Ararat, when the waters of the deluge were rising; seeking there the place of refuge in which the divine promises shall be fulfilled and whence the preserved races will start afresh and begin a new cycle of life.

The ultimate course of the United States, and to what extent it will justify the expectations of Leo XIII, is the secret which history will divulge. But, happen what may, the historian will pay due homage to the Pope, who, like a new Christopher Columbus, was the first to reach out to the transatlantic world. Columbus set out with undefined convictions; uncertain whether he would find islands or a continent in his path; convinced only that in its then condition the earth was incomplete, and that he must supply the unknown quantity. Sustained by this faith, he set a lighted torch in the prow of his caravel, the *Santa Maria*, and went forth to explore the ocean mists. This torch of the discoverer of new worlds Leo XIII, in his turn, has set in the bow of the bark of St. Peter; with the same faith he has steered this bark toward new shores, divining the need of their weight in preserving the equilibrium of Christendom.

Above all the noble enterprises of his Pontificate, this perception will remain one of the first titles to fame of this glorious initiator.

E. Melchior de Vogüé.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MIDDLE GROUND ON THE TARIFF.

A LONG and varied practical experience in business has led me to conclusions in regard to the tariff question differing somewhat from those generally entertained by the advocates of a national Protective policy, although I have always favored that policy and am still a believer in its fundamental principles. In the course of this experience, I was led to an examination of the conditions of home manufacture,—especially in its relations to the protective system,—and to the discovery, as I think, of the errors of the high Protective school in which I had been educated. At the same time, I saw clearly the impracticability of the Free-Trade ideas which represent the other extreme in the tariff question.

One characteristic of our people impressed me strongly,—the tendency to overdo in any branch of manufacture that seemed especially profitable. This is natural; but its effect is, upon the whole, injurious. Some forty years since, the manufactures of New England were mainly confined to medium grades of broadcloth, cassimeres, and satinets. These, together with flannel and negro cloths, constituted the bulk of woollen and worsted fabrics; and in cotton goods the lines were mainly sheetings, shirtings, print cloths, and printed calicoes. There were, of course, varieties of manufacture, such as cambrics, silesias, cotton flannels, etc.; but the staple woollens and cottons before-named made up fully two-thirds of the whole dry-goods manufacture of New England. It struck me then, that competition was too great in plain fabrics, such as broadcloths and cassimeres, in woollens; and in sheetings and shirtings among cotton goods. The inclination to adopt prevailing manufactures, and to attempt little or nothing in producing variety in style, color, or pattern, was evident to anyone familiar with the domestic fabrics of the time; and to this I ascribe the occasional difficulties which beset the manufacturer. As factories multiplied without bringing variations in fabrics, this trouble became more pronounced; and, in my judgment, it was a constant obstacle to satisfactory results.

The obvious inference is, that successful manufacturers must study, and be governed by, the laws of supply and demand, and that whatever stimulates an unhealthy competition will inevitably bring disaster to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the competitors. The result is at first beneficial to consumers; but, in the measure of its interference with industrial prosperity, it must finally compel the people to pay dearly, on account of the scanty supply which must follow unprofitable manufacture.

I think the same principle holds good in the adjustment of the tariff; and it is to its application in this respect that I propose to advocate a middle ground between the two extremes, which men of either party can occupy.

The argument in favor of a protective tariff, as I understand it, is this: It is desirable for many substantial reasons, that manufacturing industry should be encouraged. First, because it furnishes greater and more varied employment to labor; and, second, because it renders a nation more independent and self-supporting. This proposition seems elementary and can hardly be contradicted, except upon the assumption that a purely agricultural people would be quite as prosperous by exchanging products of the soil for the fabrics we propose to manufacture. This alternative is so thoroughly against modern theories of progressive civilization, that its discussion would be a waste of time; and it is safe to assume that it would be scouted by a vast majority of the people of the United States. In popular estimation, the encouragement of manufacturing industry is vital to the intelligent development of the nation. If, then, manufacturing industry is desirable, we come to the question of the best means to its successful and permanent establishment.

If all conditions as to labor and raw materials were equal throughout the civilized world, the question would be a comparatively simple one. We should then need only the requisite machinery and skill to compete with foreign manufactures; but if we have to compete with cheaper labor and cheaper raw materials, we must overcome these disadvantages or abandon the attempt to manufacture. I do not see how this competition can be met in any way except by a judicious tariff; and I think the advocates of Free Trade may be safely challenged to meet this argument, unless indeed they contend that domestic manufacture is not essential to national prosperity. For, if foreign manufacturers command cheaper labor and cheaper raw materials, how, without the intervention of a protective tariff, can home manufacturers succeed in competing with them? This position, it seems to me, constitutes the strength of the protective tariff argument.

It may be fairly urged that American skilled labor is generally more intelligent than foreign labor, and that, consequently, a given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of workmen employed in domestic manufactures will produce more than a corresponding number in foreign countries. It may be added that the inventive faculties of American workmen are more active, and that the history of manufactures in the United States shows constant and ingenious improvement in machinery and economical methods. All this may be admitted; but the fact remains, that the obstacles presented at the start are insurmountable unless neutralized by a protective tariff. Superior skill can only be acquired by experience; and labor-saving devices are stimulated by thorough study of manufacturing processes. The superiority claimed can be established only by providing the opportunities for developing inventive faculties. Thus, even under the advantages claimed for American workmen, it is indispensable to encourage the establishment of industries which, with present conditions, could not live under competition. Such works, when thus introduced as new enterprises, have been correctly described as being in the infancy of development. Even if the conditions as to labor and raw materials were equal, it would require some time for the introduction of regular and systematic work, and for the adaptation of the manufacture to the markets which it is desired to supply. But, handicapped in the competition with cheaper labor and raw materials, it is superfluous to discuss the minor points of skill and intelligence. Competition under such circumstances is impossible.

I think the extremists who represent the parties to the tariff controversy are, on the one hand, those who contend that the duties should be higher and more comprehensive, and, on the other, those who consider that the duties are much too high, and that the list embraces many commodities which should be free. It is between these two political schools that I find the "middle ground" upon which I think that reasonable men of both the great political parties can stand.

The first consideration should determine the principle upon which tariff protection should be founded. This is plainly indicated by the conditions of competition, and is easily arrived at. The cost of manufacture is mainly governed by the cost of labor and raw materials. If these raw materials are imported and admitted duty free by foreign countries, it follows that, to be upon equal terms in this respect, we must enable our manufacturers to obtain their raw materials at the same cost, or cover the additional cost by a higher duty upon the fabrics. In either case, the amount of protection should at least cover the difference in cost. This would be a safety-point and would leave the field of competition free. Next, it seems absolutely necessary to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

open our ports to the admission of all raw materials duty free, unless such a policy would seriously interfere with the production of such materials in this country. In the latter case, it would be necessary to increase the duty on foreign fabrics to the extent of the advantage gained from raw materials used in these goods. This would be a simple matter. It is easy to ascertain the difference in the cost of labor and raw materials, and, consequently, to decide the actual advantage possessed by the foreign manufacturer. The tariff to meet the case,—to be in harmony with the system which I think should be adopted,—would base its duties upon the difference in cost.

The reasons in favor of this policy are, in my judgment, of the most substantial character. The inequality of conditions is fully overcome by it; and the domestic manufacturer is provided with a shield against the cheap labor of foreign countries. Here, it seems to me, the protection should stop, inasmuch as all the duty beyond that point would simply add to the profits of the manufacturer at the cost of the consumer. Beyond this guarantee the duty should not go, because it would simply act as a prohibition to foreign competition at just the time when that competition should be admitted. If, for example, a duty of 10, 20, or 30 per cent ad valorem on woollen goods would cover the inequalities to which I have alluded, and enable the manufacturer to make a good profit, it would be all he could reasonably demand.

But there is another point of view which, taken by the manufacturer, supports the "middle ground" of customs duties on the lines indicated. If the duties should be high enough to be virtually a prohibition to imports, it would give such an advantage to home manufacturers as to tempt too many into the particular industry or industries which could secure this large profit. The result of this would be unhealthy competition, over-production, a surfeited market, and all the deplorable consequences of a demoralized and declining business. This disastrous reaction, which is inevitable under the stimulus of the large profits promised by the high duties, is the most formidable obstacle to home manufacture encountered in this country. We can trace it through all its phases of initiation, growth, and prosperity, and then, with accurate foresight, predict its overgrowth, its over-supply, and all the disasters of a suicidal industrial strife. It is in view of such consequences that men of broad intelligence and practical knowledge in manufacturing openly advocate a moderate tariff, rather than one which prohibits, to the extent of extorting high prices and un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasonable profits. Such a policy is fatal to the manufacturers; and the practical among them do not hesitate to express this view.

I consider the admission duty free of raw materials used in our various manufacturing industries a very important auxiliary in the line of protection; for it is quite obvious that we must be upon an equal footing with foreign manufacturers in this respect, in order to compete with nations which obtain their materials free of duty.

At this stage of the discussion we come in contact with the wool-growers of the West, who protest against the admission of free wool upon the averment that without duty the wool industry cannot prosper. They claim, too, that the wool-grower is as much entitled to protection as the manufacturer. The claim does not appear to me reasonable; but it is, nevertheless, entitled to respectful consideration.

For many years, the woollen manufacturers of New England have been contending for free raw materials, and especially for free wool, upon the ground that without such legislation we cannot compete with foreign manufacturers, or maintain the woollen mills we have, upon an equal footing with these outside competitors. This proposition in the interest of the manufacturer seems to occupy impregnable ground; and it is only the argument of the wool-grower that requires examination.

Wool-growing, or sheep-farming, requires, in the first place, cheap and suitable grazing-lands. In this respect the United States cannot be at much disadvantage, as compared with Australia and other wool-growing nations. As to labor, which is not a very important part of the cost of wool, it is, of course, to be considered in the competition with countries where labor is very cheap. Admitting all this, the practical question is, at how much less cost can fine grades of wool be raised and landed in our ports than the wool of the United States? A satisfactory answer to this question requires expert knowledge; but it can be determined beyond a doubt. This would apply, as already stated, to fine grades of wool only; as such grades alone are raised in the United States. If then it should be demonstrated that fine wools cannot be raised in this country in competition with foreign countries, in consequence of the difference in cost, we should be in a position to enter upon the second inquiry which I now propose.

The argument of the manufacturer in favor of free wool is, that it will assist in enabling him to compete with foreign manufacturers who obtain free wool. Now, if this be true, and if, with an adequate tariff to offset cheap labor, the woollen manufacturers of this country can,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the result, extend and multiply the woollen mills of the country, is it not quite possible, nay probable, that the greater home demand for wool created by the increase in the manufacturing industry in this branch would not only increase largely the consumption of domestic wool, but eventually raise its market price; inasmuch as the largest importation of foreign wools has always been in the coarser grades, such as carpet wools, etc.?

This question, I think, can be determined fairly only by a thorough inquiry assisted by expert knowledge; but it is obviously an important matter from either the standpoint of the manufacturer or that of the wool-grower. If the conclusions arrived at, after a full and impartial investigation, justify the position taken by the wool-grower, then the duty on woollen and worsted fabrics should be increased to the extent of the advantage possessed by the foreign manufacturer in this respect. It appears to me, however, that, as a general principle, it is thoroughly consistent with the policy of moderate and judicious protection to admit duty free the raw materials used in our manufactures. It is easy to conceive, by way of illustration, the injurious effects which a duty imposed by Great Britain on cotton would have on fabrics made of that material in that country, while in other countries it was free to rival manufacturers. Justice to the wool-grower calls for an impartial decision of this point, after a complete exploration of the ground.

The "middle ground" argument which this paper offers, was forcibly and clearly presented by the Hon. Abram S. Hewitt in the House of Representatives in 1882. Mr. Hewitt, at that time a member of Congress from New York, was then and had been for many years a manufacturer of iron. The following resolutions, offered by him, embrace the essential points advocated in his speech:—

"*Resolved*, That the bill creating a tariff commission be recommitted, with instructions to the Committee on Ways and Means to report within thirty days, or at an earlier day if it be practicable, a bill based upon the following instructions:

First. That all raw materials, meaning thereby all materials which have not been subjected to any process of manufacture, and all waste products, meaning thereby all waste materials which are fit only to be manufactured, and all chemicals which are not produced in this country, and alcohol for use in manufactures, shall be placed upon the free list.

Second. That, so far as possible, specific duties shall be substituted for ad valorem duties, and that in determining such specific duties the average dutiable value of imports during the last three years shall be taken as the standard of value, upon which no higher rate of duty shall be imposed than shall be necessary to compensate for the difference in the cost of labor at home and abroad ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pended in the production of such products, after making due allowance for the expenses of transportation, and that the rate of duty shall not in any case, except on luxuries, exceed 50 per cent of such average dutiable value."

It is scarcely necessary to say that the policy outlined in these resolutions was advocated by Mr. Hewitt with the logical power and clearness characteristic of that gentleman's arguments. I have not space to quote from these arguments; but I strongly recommend, to all who feel an interest in the subject, a perusal of this speech and of another upon the same subject, delivered by him in 1884.

I think the opinions of a man of Mr. Hewitt's practical experience and broad intelligence are important and especially entitled to respect. I think, too, that a large proportion of fair, disinterested business men will agree with Mr. Hewitt in the position taken by him.

Hasty legislation in this country is, in my judgment, one of the greatest evils to which business men are subjected. Partisan feeling exerts too strong an influence in the decision of questions which, in their nature, should be non-partisan, but which, unfortunately, are adopted by one side or the other as a party issue, and worked in that way to influence votes; although it is well understood that a wide difference of opinion exists among the individual members of these parties. Coming to the two great parties of the present time for an illustration, I find many protective-tariff men among the Democrats, and many of the opponents of that policy among the Republicans. I do not see, under the circumstances, why the tariff should be considered an article of party creed. I see no reason why Democrats may not be Protectionists, or Republicans Free-Traders; but I can find strong reasons for the occupation of the "middle ground" by both parties. The close and peculiar relations of the tariff question with the great business interests of the country appear to call for a more impartial study of the subject than it is likely to receive, if proclaimed as a party issue. No possible harm could come to either division, if its doubtful members should remain neutral until the most careful and searching investigation should be made by a commission composed of an equal number from each of the great parties. This would prevent premature conclusions and hasty legislation.

In 1888, it had become evident that many of the duties on foreign imports, as well as the taxes under the internal-revenue laws, were unnecessarily burdensome. Most of these unpopular laws were the relics of a system of taxation introduced by the exigencies of war and cheerfully acquiesced in by a patriotic people. The proposition to re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form our revenue laws, implied in the discussions of the period, met the views of a vast number of voters of both political parties, and was the promise of a careful revision of customs duties and internal-revenue laws consistent with the conditions and wants of foreign and domestic trade. It was responsive to what seemed to be a popular impulse in favor of tariff reform, and was thus generally recognized. The result of this agitation was the passage, in 1890, of what is known as the McKinley Bill. It is not my purpose to criticize this law; but it certainly did not meet the expectations of those who had been urging tariff reform, and the consequence was seen in a wave of discontent which swept over the land. To this bill, as much as to anything tangible in political controversies, the Republican party owed its defeat in 1892.

Again, upon the accession of the Democratic party to the administration of national affairs, Congress—obeying, apparently, the same impulse of popular will—passed the Tariff Bill which is now in force. The recent election did not turn upon this issue, as in 1892, although opposition to the Wilson tariff was a part of the Republican platform. The financial question took precedence of all others; and to the firm and decided stand taken by the Republican party in favor of sound money, its success is largely due. If the regular Democratic convention held in Chicago had adopted a strong declaration in favor of an honest financial policy, and had omitted the extraordinary anarchistic features of its actual declaration, the result of the election would have been doubtful; especially with the Southern States solidly united in support of Democratic principles.

The fact is significant enough to give greater force to the proposal urged in this paper, in favor of a calm, thorough, and strictly impartial investigation of the whole tariff question before fresh legislation is attempted. This can be secured only by occupying the "middle ground" with such force and persistence as will prevent the domination of extreme Protective ideas upon the one hand, or of Free Trade upon the other. The composition of the next Congress renders the latter contingency out of the question; but the danger of a movement in the other direction calls for the exercise of cool and deliberate judgment.

A frank and candid examination of both the McKinley and the Wilson bills would, I am confident, expose glaring defects; but, to correct them, I believe a different method should be pursued than that adopted by Congress in passing either of those vitally important measures. It is with this end in view that I appeal to non-partisan and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dispassionate intelligence to take position on the "middle ground," for the benefit of the people and not of a party.

It cannot have escaped the observation of all who keep in touch with the movements and fluctuations of business that the mere agitation of changes in the tariff system of the country, the extent and bearing of which cannot be determined in advance, has always checked business activity in every direction. The merchant, the manufacturer, the producer, and the consumer are equally in the dark as to the conditions which may be established, and the especial influence of those conditions on their respective occupations. The importer, unable to determine whether duties on foreign goods may be advanced or reduced, dares not accumulate any stock in advance of temporary demands; the manufacturer is equally uncertain as to the measure of protection on which he can rely, and is unable to form any trustworthy opinion as to duties on raw materials; the producer in agriculture or in mining can make no well-founded calculation upon the home demand for his products; and the whole area of commercial energy and enterprise is pervaded by a thick mist of hesitation and distrust.

Such were the results which followed the various phases of the McKinley Bill; and the same blighting effects were witnessed as the Wilson Bill dragged slowly through Congressional manipulation.

Such disturbances in the machinery of business are unhealthy and demoralizing, and should be avoided.

Following the precedents established by Congress in the enactment of the McKinley and the Wilson tariffs, we might expect similar attempts to reverse tariff laws which have not been long enough in operation to enable the people to estimate their drawbacks or their advantages. Such superficial methods of constructing laws pregnant with good or evil results are utterly unworthy a great and enlightened nation, and are especially inconsistent with the proclaimed policy of a free government. The science of taxation is in itself a profound study; embracing as it does those principles of equity upon which all good government is founded, and calling for the exercise of impartial judgment and mature consideration, in order to give a system the advantage of a wide distribution of its burden, and to render its collection easy. Nothing is more odious to taxpayers than a system which seems to favor one class at the expense of another; and in tariff legislation this feature deserves especial examination. Particular industries are inclined to seek a protection which is equivalent to prohibition; thus excluding the competition of foreign manufactures. Taxation for revenue wisely established

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finds a forcible illustration in a small duty on imports of tea, coffee, and sugar; so light as to be scarcely felt by the consumer, and so widely distributed as to be practically imperceptible. A few cents per pound on tea, coffee, and sugar will produce a large sum from the imports of the United States and will be cheerfully borne, while the same amount collected on commodities not in general use would be considered exacting and burdensome.

The plain inference is, I think, that the machinery of taxation should be most carefully adjusted; not only that its burdens may be distributed over the largest number, but that it may not work for the special benefit of any single interest.

As between the advocates of the Cobden School in England, with "Free Trade" as the motto to express its creed, and that of Greeley and Cary in the United States, with "Protection" as its watchword, I would interpose the calm and deliberate judgment of those who are disposed to examine both sides of the question in the light of practical experience. This in no way reflects upon the well-recognized intelligence of those eminent leaders of public opinion; nor does it detract from the value of their conclusions, drawn from their points of view and from the conditions which governed their opinions at the time of formation. Thus, just as commercial conditions in Great Britain led that country at one time to adopt a protective policy to encourage the development of manufacturing industry, and in later years to a complete reversal of it in favor of a tariff for revenue only, so it is reasonable to modify opinions in the United States in accordance with the progressive changes in the world of industry and trade.

It is obvious that Great Britain,—with an increase in its population to an extent much beyond its domestic food-supply,—having established its superiority in manufacture, must seek the best method of extending the use of its fabrics in foreign markets, and, at the same time, must invite a free competition in its own market of the food-products of other countries. The Protectionist of this country might, therefore, be a Free-Trader in Great Britain and *vice versa*, and in both cases be governed by intelligent and consistent regard for the ruling conditions. Public policy in such matters must be elastic according to the growth, development, and resources of the nation. No cast-iron rules will meet the case.

It is difficult to understand why the tariff question should be presented as a question between the two great parties of the day. It is certainly reasonable to suppose that extremists are to be found in both; and it would be hard to determine the distribution. It can hardly be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

asserted that the Protective policy is a distinctly Republican party creed, when such a staunch Democrat as the late Mr. Randall was among its most earnest supporters; nor can it be claimed with truth, that Free Trade has not many advocates among Republicans. It is altogether reasonable to conclude that the question has never been a real party issue, although party conventions have often appeared to make it so; and it is also an undeniable fact, that Democratic platforms have pledged the party to tariff reform, while, on the other hand, Republican platforms have generally assumed the championship of the Protective policy. It seems to me, however, that party lines cannot be drawn as to the merits of a question so dependent upon practical knowledge and relative conditions, which can only be understood after the collection of full and trustworthy evidence.

Hence, to meet the peculiarities of the case, I venture to urge the appointment, by act of Congress, of a commission composed of members of both parties, invested with full power to collect evidence on the subject, with the view of reporting such changes, if any, as may, in the opinion of the commission be desirable and advantageous to the industrial interests of the country. I would also have the bill provide that the commission should sit during the intervals of Congress, and report at the end of one year. It will require at least this period to enable the commission to gather the evidence, written and oral, which will always be available for such an inquiry. The testimony and views of all who can furnish practical information, and who have made the subject a study should be invited. In this way the commission can be provided with data upon which to base their recommendations. Such an inquiry should embrace the treatment of raw materials used in our manufactures, and give especial attention to the question of free wool. At the end of the year the Wilson tariff will have been in operation about three years,—a period long enough, probably, to test its adaptability to the industrial interests of the country; and people will have had an opportunity to judge its provisions during years of average prosperity, as well as during the years of depression which followed its enactment. It will then be wise to consider whether its defects, if any, can be removed by judicious amendment, instead of going through the tedious and disturbing process of a new bill.

Government which seeks the greatest good and the permanent prosperity of its people should not be carried away by temporary popular excitement in regard to legislation which interests and must affect the whole country. Our system of finance and our revenue laws require

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and deserve the careful study and impartial consideration of the best minds in the country. When this is recognized sufficiently to cause the elimination of partisan feeling from the questions which cannot be claimed as the distinct creed of either party, the country will have the benefit of well-digested laws, to the substantial advantage of all.

The fact that a similar commission has once before made an investigation, as to contemplated changes in the tariff, is not a valid objection to another inquiry in the same direction. To be of real advantage to Congress and to the country, the non-partisan composition of the commission must be scrupulously observed. An impartial court, selected, after the manner of the Venezuelan Commission, from the most able and trustworthy men in the country and outside of Congress, is what we need for the proper and satisfactory adjustment of this important question.

It is alleged that under the existing tariff the revenue will be inadequate to pay the expenses of Government. This may be true ; but the years of business depression during which it has been in operation furnish no fair criterion of its productiveness. The year 1897 will probably enable us to form a much more trustworthy opinion in the case. At all events, judicious amendments will be less hazardous than a sweeping revision ; and the necessity and character of such amendments can be determined with much greater precision by a longer and more thorough trial. The country will suffer less by a delay which confirms judgment than by hasty and purely experimental legislation.

I have tried in this paper to discuss the question from a strictly business standpoint, with entire fairness to both of the great political parties ; and, if I have been at all successful in thus presenting the subject, the "middle ground" will offer a compromise beneficial to the great industrial and commercial interests of the country.

Emerging from one of the most exciting elections known in our political history, with the triumphant verdict of the people in favor of sound money and national honesty, we are bound to admit that this gratifying result has been greatly aided by the best men in the Democratic party. Under such circumstances, it would be a graceful compliment for the incoming President to pay to these intelligent and patriotic citizens, to treat the tariff question as one of the great national problems which require for their correct solution thorough study and comprehensive intelligence outside the political arena.

O. D. Ashley.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ESSENTIALS IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

In the preceding article, the opening one of this series, I discussed the possibility of securing satisfactory results in the so-called essentials if the course of study in the elementary schools were materially enriched. I argued, that nothing definite could now be said on this subject, because no agreement had yet been arrived at, either in regard to what is essential, or as to what results in individual branches may be deemed satisfactory. Until our ideas are clear on these matters, we shall of course be unable to estimate how much time it is necessary to devote to the formal studies, and how much should be set aside for work that is purely educative in its nature.

Before it will be possible to decide how far the curriculum may be safely broadened, then, it will be necessary to define clearly the limits of the essentials, as well as to establish standards that will enable us to tell how much time is required to cover satisfactorily the indispensable ground. And the purpose of the present article is to throw some light on these points. For want of space the discussion of the problem from the psychological standpoint, which I had intended to undertake in the present paper, will be deferred to the next number.

In endeavoring to define the legitimate limits of the positive knowledge and skill that may be regarded as essential, a process of exclusion will be required. It will be necessary to exclude, first, matters belonging to the category of mental gymnastics, *i. e.*, measures introduced into the school course solely with a view to the development of the faculties; and, second, matters of detail that the layman is not expected to possess in the form of ready knowledge, and which are found in the school course simply because they have been handed down by tradition.

At present the time devoted to the three R's alone, in the mechanical schools, is about 70 per cent. It might be possible, however, through a process of exclusion such as I have indicated, to reduce this time by 50 per cent or more. Indeed, so great may be the change brought about, that what is now regarded as the body of the work of the elementary school would constitute only a side issue. If this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be true, then of course the possibilities of enriching the course of study would be almost unlimited. Moreover, the exclusion of unnecessary material would form only one part of the reduction in time. An equal reduction might be secured by an exercise of economy in actual teaching,—a subject that will be discussed in my next article.

As I have drawn a line between the essentials in a course of study and measures of educational discipline, it may be thought that I do not appreciate the value of the latter. This, however, is by no means the case. My reason for making the distinction is that, while I am of the opinion that the people are fully justified in demanding certain results in matters of useful knowledge and skill, I believe that in questions of educational discipline no universal course should be laid down, but that considerable freedom should be allowed to the exercise of judgment on the part of individual educators. The problem of mental gymnastics is still so completely veiled in obscurity, and opinions among educators in regard to the relative values of disciplinary measures vary so markedly, that dogmatism is entirely unjustifiable.

While some educators believe that the most valuable disciplinary work lies in pushing the formal branches of study beyond a reasonable point, others are of the opinion that the disciplinary value of the formal studies is far inferior to that involved in *content* studies; and that, in consequence, the time not devoted to instruction in what is actually indispensable, in the formal lines, should be devoted to such branches as the arts, the sciences, history, and literature,—subjects having a direct influence in developing æsthetic taste, as well as interest in nature and humanity. It follows, therefore, that while the individual educator oversteps the limit of his authority when he fails to give due recognition to the conventional side of education, the people overstep their authority when they needlessly condemn the child to a life of drudgery, and deprive him of elevating influences, by demanding more than their due in the way of conventionalities.

One more point requires to be mentioned before entering into the discussion of details. It may be argued that, as our ideals are not fixed, the essentials of a school course cannot be clearly defined. While it is true that the demands of society are constantly changing, and that what may now be regarded as useful knowledge may not be so regarded at some indefinite period in the future, history nevertheless proves that the process of evolution is so slow, that, if standards should be set in accordance with the demands of to-day, they would answer the purpose for many years to come. Indeed, I do not think it an exaggeration to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say, that, if standards should once be fixed, the labor involved in changing them, to keep pace with the process of evolution, would be, figuratively speaking, as insignificant as that involved in repairing a building, from time to time, as required by ordinary wear and tear.

The time may arrive when every individual will be permitted to spell as he chooses. But the educator who to-day should prepare his pupils for such an era would not be entitled to encouragement. Nor are we justified in believing that the period is near at hand when neat and legible writing will no longer be regarded as a necessary accomplishment. Again, the ability to use good English, and facility in handling figures, will not grow out of fashion within the next decade. Taken all in all, then, whatever may be said of the evolution of pedagogical ideals, we cannot consider as serious any arguments to the effect that, because we do not know exactly what the future may bring forth, we cannot tell what should now be taught in the elementary schools.

The dividing line between positive knowledge and skill on the one hand and mental gymnastics on the other may be made clear by a simple illustration.

Society expects, for example, that the individual shall be able to write a letter in well-constructed sentences and without grammatical errors. It is not concerned, however, as to whether or not the writer is able to analyze the sentences, or to parse the words in his letter. If facts should prove, beyond question, that individuals who can parse and analyze with facility are able to construct better sentences than those who are unfamiliar with technical grammar, this subject might rightly be placed among the essentials of school work. If, however, it should be proved that the English employed by those who had not studied technical grammar was practically as good as that employed by those who had had a thorough grounding in the subject, then it could not be regarded as essential, but would belong to the domain of mental gymnastics.

In the latter case, the question of introducing technical grammar into the school course would be purely and simply a problem of relative values, *i. e.*, a question as to whether it would pay best to devote, say, thirty minutes daily, for four or five years, to grammar, or whether more profit would be derived by devoting this time to matters of importance and interest now crowded out of many of our schools on the plea of lack of time. Whether, or in how far, it is possible to lead the child to use good English without instruction in technical grammar, is an entirely different question. It is one, however, that cannot be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decided by *a priori* reasoning. Nothing short of the study of results will suffice to bring the truth to light.

As in language, so in arithmetic the question of mental gymnastics plays a prominent part. While facility in ciphering, to a certain point, is demanded of every individual, whatever is done in this branch beyond what is directly useful and practical must be regarded as disciplinary in its nature. Consequently, the question arises, whether, in the arrangement of a school programme, it is advisable to allow a certain amount of time for purely disciplinary arithmetic, or whether this time might not bring a greater return if given to matters more directly destined to elevate our social ideals.

The importance of such questions of relative values becomes strikingly apparent when we consider that thirty-five minutes a day is equivalent to an entire year out of the eight devoted to elementary education. Consequently, by economizing only a little here and there, by the exclusion of merely a part of the disciplinary measures of minor or doubtful importance,—such as drill in arithmetical puzzles, in superfine penmanship, in parsing and analysis beyond what is actually needed,—it might be possible to save as much as the equivalent of two school years, which might then be utilized toward enriching the course of study, without in any way neglecting the essentials. When the time wasted in reading aloud merely with a view to the development of oratorical power is taken into consideration, the estimate of two years is probably too conservative.

When the purely disciplinary elements in instruction are clearly determined, one step will have been made toward defining the limits of the indispensable. The next point will lie in a process of exclusion applied to matters of detail that lie beyond what the individual may be reasonably expected to possess in the way of ready knowledge and skill. This would mean in large part the elimination of many things now taught in the schools not because they are supposed to meet any particular requirement, but simply because no concerted effort has ever been made to exclude them from the traditional course of study.

The subjects that, without harm in any direction, will bear a rigid test of exclusion are spelling and penmanship. Every moment devoted to these subjects beyond what is actually needed may be regarded as wasted. When we consider that, in spite of their lack of educational value, nearly one fifth of the time in some of our schools is devoted to these two subjects, it becomes apparent that the importance of exercising economy in teaching these branches cannot be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over-estimated. In determining the ground to be covered in spelling, it is necessary simply to secure an agreement as to where the line may be drawn between words that the average individual ought to be able to spell without referring to a dictionary and those that might be safely relegated to the latter. This would lead to the omission of a very large number of words now taught in the schools and which the child may never be called upon to use.

In penmanship, it will be necessary to determine what standards of legibility may be deemed satisfactory. Owing to the importance of this subject, I beg to repeat what I stated in my last article; namely, that over-attention to penmanship, for the purpose of securing elegant writing, may mean the waste, both directly and indirectly, of an enormous amount of time. As the child, during the entire school course, is obliged to do considerable writing, apart from that intended to improve his penmanship, undue slowness in the use of the pen must be regarded as a waste of time against which provision should be made.

In arithmetic, aside from the disciplinary element, the question of how much ground it is necessary to cover in order that the pupil may be sufficiently well equipped to meet the ordinary demands of life, requires careful consideration. By exercising a wise process of exclusion, the course might be considerably abbreviated. It would be necessary here to make a careful distinction between those parts of arithmetic with which everyone ought to be conversant, and those parts concerning the more complicated calculations belonging to special lines of business, and which need to be mastered only by the specialist.

In English, in addition to the problem of mental discipline, the question as to how high the goal should be placed comes into play. In written language, limitations that do not appear in any other subject are set by the immaturity of the child-mind. In other branches, however high the goal may be placed, there is a reasonable assurance that it will be reached, provided the instruction be thorough, and ample time be provided for the purpose. In composition, however, in establishing our aims, the powers of the child must be taken into consideration. Consequently, before instruction in this subject can be conducted without undue waste, it will be necessary to learn just what the child is able to do under the most favorable circumstances. When we have learned what the most successful teachers have accomplished, and how much time they expended in reaching their ends, we shall have a sensible basis for determining what may be reasonably expected of the child, and how much time it is wise to devote to this branch.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Complaints to the effect that the results in written language are highly unsatisfactory are commonly heard from individuals in all walks of life, and particularly from instructors in high schools and universities. As the unsatisfactory results are usually attributed to insufficient attention to the subject in the elementary schools, the demand is made that still more time be devoted to English. But if the circumstances should be such that it is impossible to lead the average child beyond a certain point, however great the pressure may be, then of course the time expended in endeavoring to do so is wasted.

An important point to be decided before definite goals can be established, is the question of literary style. When we know the average child's limitations in this direction, we shall be able to tell whether or not it will pay to spend a great deal of time in endeavoring to lead the child to acquire the ability to write an original story, a reproduction, or a description, in good style on the first draft. Again, we shall be able to determine whether or not time and energy expended in rewriting will be sufficiently rewarded to warrant the teacher in compelling the child to labor over a composition until he feels that he can no longer improve it. That the properly trained child is able to appreciate good literary style when he finds it in the writings of others, is quite possible; but whether he is able to imitate it in his own writings, is an entirely different question.

Next, geography, and particularly that phase which treats of the location of places, the boundaries of states and countries, the length of rivers, the height of mountains, etc., offers a broad field for exclusion without true loss in any particular. How much waste there is in the old-fashioned method of teaching this subject, becomes apparent when we consider how exceedingly little the average individual has to show, a year or two after leaving school, for the numerous hours a week, during five or six years, devoted to this study. And not only from the standpoint of economy, but for other reasons as well, would the elimination of cut-and-dried facts, that properly belong to books of reference, exert a most salutary effect. For, while geography when treated in the traditional manner is one of the most burdensome subjects in the curriculum, yet, when the matters of minor importance are excluded, and substituted by valuable ideas, it becomes converted into perhaps the broadest as well as the most interesting in the entire list of school branches. While the number of facts in topographical geography that the individual is required to know in order that he may be able to take an intelligent interest in the affairs of the world is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

considerable, it is, nevertheless, very small when compared with that which the child is compelled to acquire in the traditional course of instruction. Indeed, so great, in my opinion, is the discrepancy between what the child is compelled to memorize in the old-fashioned schools and what the citizen is expected to know, that I do not regard it as an exaggeration to say that the traditional course in topographical geography might be shortened by 70 or 80 per cent without neglecting what is useful.

Last, I desire to call attention to the waste in a mechanical course in history. As in geography, so in this study would the preparation of a list of facts, limited to what is helpful and what the individual may be expected to possess as ready knowledge, bring about an enormous reduction in memory material. Of course, there are many facts that the individual ought to know and that every educated person is expected to know. But just what these facts are, and how many might be excluded, without impairment, from the traditional course, has never been properly determined. By a wise substitution of historical ideas for cut-and-dried facts of minor importance, history, like geography, would be converted from a mechanical study into a most valuable and interesting one.

What is needed, then, in order that a beginning may be made toward the solution of the problem of the course of study, is to undertake measures that will speedily lead to a clear definition of the essentials. In my opinion, the most rational plan would be to place the matter in the hands of committees, appointed preferably by the National Educational Association. If committees of, say, ten members should be appointed for each branch, the labor so divided that proper attention could be paid to details, and meetings held at frequent intervals, enough might be done in a single year to clear the course of study at least of those matters that are retained simply by tradition.

In drawing conclusions in regard to what to retain and what to omit, ordinary experiences would suffice to set the matter well under way. For the rest, it would be necessary to undertake researches leading to the discovery of the exact limits of our social demands. But the latter course would represent a later stage, which might be carried on in a more leisurely manner. In order that the work might be thoroughly conducted, a special appropriation should be made by the Government, to be placed at the disposal of the Association.

Besides defining the essentials, it will be necessary to secure standards that will give us a basis for judging what results in the essentials

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be deemed satisfactory; and not until we have these standards can it be determined how much pressure it is advisable to put on the conventional side of school work, and which methods of teaching are the most economical in point of time. But to obtain such standards, ordinary experience will not avail; nothing short of careful research, on a very broad basis, will supply the needed information.

In our country, where elementary education is characterized by absence of system, it is not unusual for individuals, whether educators or laymen, to examine a class on a set of questions selected in an arbitrary way, and to judge by the results whether or not the teacher has done satisfactory work. So long, however, as we have no standards, judgment based on the results of an examination, in a single room, school, or city, is not only absolutely worthless, but may mean a gross injustice, in estimating both the qualifications of the teachers and the value of the methods employed by them. Under existing conditions, there is only one way in which definite information in this matter can be obtained. It is by extending a reasonable test to a large number of classes, in different localities, so that all methods and conditions may be represented, and by judging of the results on a comparative basis. In this manner we are enabled to learn what results were secured by teachers in general, which classes exceeded and which fell below the average, and how much time was consumed by different methods in securing the various results. It is only in this way that we can judge whether the results obtained in any particular class, school, or city may be regarded as satisfactory.

It was with a view to the development of standards for measuring results, as well as to discover the most economical methods of teaching, that the tests in spelling, penmanship, composition, and arithmetic, to which I referred in my last article, were made. In penmanship and composition, it is of course a simple matter to employ tests that are universally applicable. In spelling and arithmetic, although the ground covered in different cities varies considerably in regard to details, I nevertheless found that, by exercising care, the tests might be so formulated that they would cover a common ground, and thus be suitable for the schools of any locality. In spelling, three different tests were employed. One was a column of fifty words; another consisted of sentences, fifty test words being employed in the lower, and seventy-five in the upper grades; and, third, the spelling in the composition test was examined. In arithmetic, the questions were so arranged as to fit the various grades. In penmanship, the general written

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work was used as a test. And, finally, in composition, I employed as a test the reproduction of a story read by the teacher to the children. This story was written specially for the purpose, and was accompanied by a picture intended to aid the children in their work. The grades examined included the fourth to the eighth school years. The results will be published in detail in future articles.

While such work as this represents only a temporary stage in the development of standards, I nevertheless believe that it will suffice to lead to definite information on the most important educational problem of the day; namely, whether or not it is possible to broaden the curriculum without detriment to the three R's. To reach a conclusion on this point, it is but necessary to learn whether or not the results in the formal studies obtained in the progressive schools compare favorably with the results in the formal lines obtained in the mechanical schools. If the pupils educated in the schools in which the bulk of the work is thoughtful and interesting should do as well in the formal studies as those brought up in the schools where the work is almost entirely formal, the feasibility of the new education would be practically proved.

Until the essentials are clearly defined, then, the question of satisfactory results must be decided on a purely comparative basis. For, as long as the ground to be covered represents a very wide area, and no discrimination is made between matters of primary and those of secondary importance, the results of an examination in a given school might be apparently so unfavorable as to convey the impression that the teaching had lacked in thoroughness, while in fact the results would compare quite favorably with those secured in other schools. By a comparative study of results, even on a much narrower basis than I have indicated, a great deal might be accomplished in a very brief period toward the solution of the problem of methods. It would simply be necessary for superintendents and teachers in neighboring localities to coöperate in a series of tests which would show the rate of progress under different methods.

When the requirements in positive knowledge and skill are limited to a reasonable point, the ideas will have an opportunity to become more thoroughly assimilated, and definite results may be demanded. Under these circumstances, it is possible that, in the course of time, absolute standards would be developed, so that it would be no longer necessary to draw comparisons on a wide basis before reaching conclusions in regard to the qualifications of a particular teacher or the excellence of a particular school.

J. M. Rice.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERN COMPOSERS IN THE LIGHT OF CONTEMPORARY CRITICISM.

"By favor illumed, by hatred obscured, his character meets us in history." What musician or artist can entirely free himself from the conditions or escape the limitations of the judgment thus expressed by the poet; and, touching more particularly the composer to whose personal activity we have been witness, what intelligent observer may venture to assume the character of an infallible judge?

A purely objective estimation and an entire impartiality are alike impossible to the conscientious critic; at the most he can only be expected to reject the favoritism and the hatred of the cliques, and to transfer historical methods to the conditions of the present. The words of the poet indicate with particular clearness the fate of the eminent men of whom this article proposes to treat.

The character of Richard Wagner has yet to be presented to us in classical purity; for his partisans and opponents still continue a struggle in which favoritism on the one hand confuses contemporaneous judgment as much as do the outbursts of hatred on the other. It may be said without exaggeration, that by far the greater part of those obstacles which it became the life-work of Wagner to overcome were occasioned by persons who the most loudly proclaimed themselves his heralds, as well as by others who professionally assumed to be the apostles of the Messiah of musical drama. Under the pretext of serving the Master, this Bayreuth advance-guard had been for more than a decade successfully endeavoring to discredit the cause, to render more difficult its comprehension, and to frighten off its true adherents. Throughout this entire period it was well-nigh impossible for an honest and respectable lover of music to declare himself a follower of Wagner, lest he should be associated with those howling dervishes of Bayreuth whose grotesque dances compromised and injured the Wagnerian cause. True and natural relationships were completely ignored. He who, revering the great creative genius of Wagner, had also the courage to maintain the rights of other composers,—even the most modern ones,—was derided: he who acknowledged the musical-philosophical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writings of Wagner to be works of importance, but did not implicitly accept their every particular as divine revelation, was denounced as a heretic. Those who admired Wagner as a dramatic poet, yet presumed to place a Goethe or a Shakespeare at his side or even before him,—in short, those who did not depopulate all Parnassus to make place for him,—were not entitled in the codex of the fanatic to be called Wagnerian. On the contrary, they were persecuted and placed in the pillory by the professional chiefs of the coterie who presumed to exercise a dictatorship of art throughout Germany. Books and pamphlets were written, and it would be difficult for anyone, not a personal witness of the feud, to give even a superficial idea of the material which, until late in the 'eighties, was served up to the Germans as Wagnerian literature.

I will endeavor to throw what light I can on the subject, and at least to indicate the arsenals from which the reaction against Wagner obtained its best ordnance.

I have already described Bayreuth as the headquarters of the Corybantes who roared forth their "Evoe Wagner" in bacchanalian frenzy. The literary orgies were celebrated in the so-called "Bayreuth Blätter," the official organ of the inner group of Wagnerians, who, with all the authority of a government order, issued to the entire Wagnerian press of Germany its parole and its battle-cry. Wolzogen, Hagen, Porges, Wirth, Franz, and others as famous as these, have been feared in their time; regarded one another mutually as gods and demi-gods; and, by means of an unprecedented terrorism, finally succeeded in their effort to be considered as true apostles and prophets of Wagnerianism, although in fact they had never been more than sonorous heralds. As affording an insight into the critical methods of the Bayreuth circle, let us take as a striking example one of the most untiring of the body-guard, Emerich Kastner, who, as the compiler of a Wagner catalogue,—a catalogue of writings and musical works by and upon Richard Wagner,—had acquired the rank and title of Great Archivist of Wagnerian literature. Kastner introduced a new critical method, based on the number of beats and the metric measure, and began to measure out the works of Wagner as one would a stretch of roadway or a field, with the intention and conviction of discovering an unsuspected and highly important principle in art. By careful computation Kastner found that "Rienzi" contained 5,980 beats; the "Flying Dutchman," 4,434; "Tannhäuser," 4,831; "Lohengrin," 5,129; the "Meistersinger," 6,513. He then announced, by means of a demon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stration whose secret will remain eternally inscrutable, that the life-destiny, and artistic experiences of Wagner were reflected in these dry numbers. In fact he went still further, and grouped together the number of beats in every single scene from the operas of the Master, continually calculating, adding, and subtracting until he reached, through purely arithmetical methods, the establishment of psychological laws. This absurd sport, played by him with figures and notes, many of his colleagues pursued with the words, syllables, nay even the single letters, of Wagner's texts. Thus a literature was created whereby mental criticism was to be replaced by those mechanical instruments—the balance, the microscope, and the knife of the vivisector. All these researches, prosecuted with much ardor, clearly demonstrated to what a degree artistic views may be lowered through blind idolatry.

Compared with the bitter battle which waged throughout Germany over Wagner, the struggles of Handel in London and Gluck in Paris were mere harmless skirmishings. To-day it is possible to consider the nature of this campaign—which was maintained throughout a decade—from a better point of view than when we stood in line of battle. We know that the cause of Wagner has conquered because of its merit, and not in consequence of the strategic methods employed by sworn Wagnerian fanatics and literary Mamelukes. The work of Wagner has triumphed, not from a paucity or adroitness of defence, but in virtue of its powerful elemental forces. This fact once accepted, we may quietly and objectively admit the superiority of the phalanxes of the opposition in the height of the quarrel; not alone numerically, but in point of intelligence and general culture.

Even at this time, when Wagner's compositions were becoming the chief support of the opera repertory, the most cultivated minds of the nation were repulsed by the artistic principles of the Master. A peculiar and frequent feature in the history of music is the fact, that a new genius—particularly when he is a reformer—convinces and wins over the lower classes with greater facility than the élite among the more cultured. Among the opponents of Wagner, from the beginning till the day of the "Nibelungen," there was continual dissatisfaction and discontent. Robert Schumann pronounced the creator of "Tannhäuser" to be clever, but a musician lacking in the sense of melody. The celebrated historian of art, Julian Schmidt, considered that opera depressing in its musical insensibility. The great theorist, Moritz Hauptmann, designated it as a totally inartistic achievement; a deception of the public, who imagined they perceived a firmament of stars, whereas they saw

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only mist. That talented poet of sentiment, Grillparzer, waxed ironical in his criticism of the overture, which, according to his own confession, made his ears ache. Emile Naumann, the poet and musical author, whose volumes have met with a wide circulation, treats of Wagner under "Epigonen," and speaks of his *leitmotiven* as *baroque* and retrograding. Hans von Hopfen, the distinguished lyrical poet and novelist, makes a clear demonstration from the text of "Tristan" that Wagner failed in the primal conception of poetic genius. Eduard Hanslick, the greatest musical æsthete of all times, still entertains the opinion that the work of Wagner is in the highest degree ruinous to art.

In these examples we have but a drop from an ocean; for not only volumes but entire libraries might be filled with what has been written against Wagner by musicians and critics, and especially by the academical modernizers of classic tradition. Many enemies, much honor!

The very existence of such a compact opposition would of itself prove that Wagner was not only a man of positive action but an iconoclast as well, and that his life-work represented an attack on all preconceived standards. Public opinion considered it to be the duty of the opera, particularly of the more modern, to represent human destiny in musical form. Guilt and atonement were the two poles between which the action must move; and this action required human beings endowed with a free will, with the right of independent consciousness, and with a sense of personal responsibility. We have here the first great fundamental law attacked by Wagner, who drew his material from Germanic sagas and northern myths, wherein man appears not as the carver of his own destiny, but as a more or less arbitrary instrument in the hands of supernatural powers. Even in "Lohengrin," the tendencies of the action indicate a point lying beyond the horizon; the hero is subject to laws to which human life offers no analogy; and his relations to the mysterious abode of the Holy Grail contain problems which we cannot approach with the customary why and wherefore.

A still greater infraction of operatic traditions is shown in "Tristan and Isolde"; for here the law of causality is disregarded at the critical point of the action, to follow the consequences of a purely mechanical miracle,—the effect of the love-potion.

Wagner also did violence to the principle I have mentioned when he introduced upon the stage his important work, the "Nibelungen" tetralogy, with all the impenetrable mysteries of the northern Edda. What arguments might not be urged against the design; against the possibility of completing what is here begun! He who had not an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

absolute familiarity with the entire northern mythology, it was universally conceded, must remain forever excluded from a proper comprehension of the four-day opera. Hence the claim made by Wagner, that his musical dramas, "Rheingold," "Walküre," "Siegfried," and "Götterdämmerung," were to constitute a dramatic festival for the nation, was in fact untenable. The people have no knowledge of the Edda, and still less appreciation of its forms, occurrences, and *motiven*. The impossibility of finding a way through the confusion of gods, giants, nixies, dwarfs, and men who, in the strangest dependence upon one another, acted now under, now above, the earth, had come to be regarded as an established fact. These gods possessing no divine power, these miracles bound by no recognized formula and anticipating their failure,—who could understand them? Alike questionable, uncontrollable, and contradictory were the diction, the incidents, and—not least of all—the music.

What a perpetration of violence was not committed against those sacred rules and models which hitherto had formed the basis of every opera! To the frequenters of the theatre, as well as to the academician, Wagner's entire method of composition appeared to be an open declaration of war against every settled principle. The compact melodies were abandoned; and the unprepared listeners found themselves reluctantly carried forth upon a boundless ocean whose roar and tumult the Master called "the infinite melody." This flood of sound, with the cadence, rhythm, modulation, harmony, and especially the declamatory intervals as yet wholly novel, fell upon ears still captive to the influence of the old operatic melodies; making it difficult for them to comprehend this new revelation. The laity, and others of high musical culture, mutually confessed that to them this music presented the accumulation of abstruse inharmoniousness and clanking discord. The erroneous estimate of these violent effects arose however from the inexperience of the audience. It has in fact been demonstrated that "Rheingold" does not contain half so many *forte* measures as the C-minor symphony of Beethoven. It was the difficult music of "Rheingold," in contradistinction to the familiar tones of a Beethoven symphony, which produced the impression of fearful uproar.

A generation must pass away and a new generation arise before Wagner's works can become the common property of the nation. So long as we were occupied with Wagner's activity our constant endeavor from a purely objective standpoint was to attain gradually to a fuller appreciation of the magnitude of what he had accomplished.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The phrase "reform of the opera" does not comprehend the full nature of his achievement. Had Wagner began simply where Gluck left off, and undertaken his reform as the continuation of Gluck's, the full acquiescence of his contemporaries had been less difficult to secure. The conception of reform presupposes that the initiatory mind must experience the emotions, be able to awaken the slumbering ideals of his time, assimilate, formulate, and bring them to a perfected expression,—neither more nor less. In common with contemporaneous sentiment, Gluck held the desire to see the opera freed from every falsity, conventionalism, and redundancy,—a desire he furthered by melodious expression, while working exactly in the direction prescribed by the unspoken but clearly existent ideals which his period demanded. Another Gluck in our day would have been in place. Gluck's reform did not meet the requirements of the time; and the main evil combated by him, namely, the dependence of the stage upon the necessities of the singer, reappeared in as urgent a form as before.

A reformer to-day would have to take Gluck's programme as it is clearly expressed in the preface of "Alceste," and which,—certain to retain its validity for all time,—with the present increase of musical resources, might thus be brought to completion. Wagner, if we consider the musician principally, went far beyond this point; for he raised the musical level of the period, creating, as he did, new demands upon it. He satisfied the longing after he had personally awakened it.

No programme could express what it was given Wagner to fulfil; no necessity of the time, no presentiment of national feeling, could indicate the remote point attained by the musical genius of Wagner.

In the reform separating Wagner from Gluck we find three specially marked points of difference: the material employed, the form, and the expression. A departure from the old type of opera, the dissolution of the fixed and definite forms which Gluck had only indicated without formulating as a principle, might well be regarded as a demand of the spirit of the age. It was felt that for dramatic mobility a greater constructive continuity was desirable; consciously or unconsciously, objection was made to the restraints which had been artificially introduced in the course of the action. With the rejection of the undramatic and concertante in the external construction, a thorough change in the musical expression was required. Had Wagner been led to this reform by the light of an intelligent criticism, he would have been satisfied by the removal of the disturbing barriers between individualized parts, by covering more carefully the musical seams,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and by bridging over with pleasing melody the great gaps in the former construction of the opera. That would have been a relatively convenient solution of the problem; and it would, perhaps, have sufficed for another half-century. Wagner, however, foresaw, with the clear perception distinguishing true genius, that music *per se* was capable of and required greater expansion; hence he proceeded to dissolve and recast, in the fire of his genius, the entire ariose and recitative material of the past. This revolution and new creation in music Wagner undertook and carried out in a manner which we must to-day recognize as far exceeding our every hope and dream. He succeeded in rendering the music itself so perfectly mobile that every emotion and turn, however slight, yielding itself readily to his will, was incorporated into the dramatic development; and he also created in the orchestra an entirely new organ of expression.

To-day we regard Wagner's symphonic orchestra as the most perfect interpreter of his thoughts; the accompanying conscience, as it were, of the drama. In it we recognize and admire a polyphonic instrument by means of which expression is made eloquent beyond the power of words; unveiling and illumining the underlying fabric of the action. The nature of Wagner's work is hereby recognizable, —the conception of the dramatic placed in sovereignty over the musical, while the melody executes the will of every thought, be it prominent or subordinate. This order is maintained by means of "the infinite melody" and the perfect control of the *leitmotiven*, by which determined personalities, characters, events, and relations are identified in the polyphonic character of the instrumentation. The question whether Wagner was correct in the treatment of his *leitmotiven*, or whether he overshot his object, remains an open one to this day. To express my own views, I should say that overloading is here apparent; marring the enjoyment of almost all Wagner's scores, and serving to confuse rather than to enlighten the listener. No continuous study of the score is of the least avail to overcome this difficulty; for even the most musical ear is not always able to comprehend and unite the many disjointed details of the descriptive *leitmotiven*. It is not the principle I oppose, but the exaggeration in its application.

Had Wagner's musical power been weaker than it was, he had been infallibly wrecked by the superabundance of his motive ballast. In fact in the attempt to apply to the artificial structure of Wagner's work any self-constructed system of æsthetics, based upon experience in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

musical development and sharply defined by comparison, a residuum of unsolved problems will always remain.

A natural musical emotion refuses to accept musical equivalents for perfectly definite conceptions and occurrences that can only be expressed in words which retain their unchanged course throughout an entire great work. From this it is evident that Wagner was met by no unexpressed need, but that he himself first introduced the demand for absolute congruity of the music with the action. Even he who, with trained comprehension and open heart, yields to the enjoyment of these works without becoming ensnared by the delusive æsthetics of Bayreuth, is confronted to-day by a great problem. He cannot permit himself to recognize the method as a universal criterion; and yet, at the same time, he can recognize no other standard for the stirring effect. The result is indeed enormous, and is as overpowering for the moment as it is lasting in its influence. Its far-reaching power attracts ever-widening circles, and will make tributary, at no distant day, every part of the world where good music is appreciated. These discrepancies may perhaps be reconciled in confessing that Wagner's musical genius is greater than his reformatory genius. His theory proclaims the supremacy of the drama; but the truly revealed worth of the music proclaims its sovereignty. The principle forces the *leitmotif* to render a service impossible in the degree required by Wagner; but the inherent value of the *motiven* and their symphonic developments is so considerable that from them is raised a glorified structure, considered purely musically, without characterizing each individual block. The method itself, therefore, may not be regarded as the most valuable part in the heritage of Wagner; and it is doubtful whether, in the manner of its transmission, it can form the foundation of a school. One might reply that the German, and in part also the French, opera-houses produce every year many works which are brought out in the "modern German style,"—emanations, almost without exception, of the apish and superficial imitators of Wagner, who represent no school capable of further development, but only a collection of dubious and slavish copies. All the later Wagnerian composers—the miniature Wagners of our epoch—play, in the household of music, an analogous part to that of an orchestra-leader who is a composer. They have worked over the musical remains of Felix Mendelssohn and Karl Maria von Weber; they have appropriated the musical emanations of master-minds; they imitate their style without manifesting their original power; and the next great wave of music sweeps them aside,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whether he be an orchestra-leader of the old school, like Reissiger and Kalliwoda, or of the new, such as Ritter and Richard Strauss, it is practically the same.

The last few years show conclusively that the most powerful individuals among the moderns are by no means disposed to subject themselves to the extreme demands of the Wagnerian theory. The modern operas rising above mediocrity, as those of the young Italians, Leoncavallo and Mascagni, besides the "Manon" of Massenet, "Hänsel und Gretel" of Humperdinck, and others, repudiate in their chief parts the principle of Bayreuth. They however evince that their authors have learned much from Wagner, and their melodizing shows the profundity of his influence. But, in the sense established by the masters of the old Neapolitan and Venetian schools of music, Wagnerian art will certainly never attain an efficient posterity. Its principles manifest a purely personal character, and hence are unavailable as models which can be adapted by any successor. In respect of gigantic powers of invention, they would almost suffice to create a new style in each of the great dramatic designs to which they are applied. In fact the source of the material seems to have been absolutely closed against those whose desire was to follow in Wagner's footsteps; as if the entire wealth of the northern myths had been poured into the lap of a single mortal. Hence Wagner's true legacy comprises both his great works, wherein he speaks and sings directly to us, and the sovereign intellect which, through these works, has flooded the world.

Interrogating the intellect rather than the method, we must grant that, in its comprehensive sense, no master has acquired a larger following than the Master of Bayreuth. It may honestly be said that, whenever musical talent is inclined to fresh achievement, the genius of Wagner is strongly felt; while the effect of his protest against a blind adherence to older traditions, the formal narrow-mindedness, and the abuse of pure art for material gain is everywhere manifest. Both directly and indirectly Wagner's supremacy is made clear.

To-day, without reference to Wagner,—who has become the sole criterion in the general estimation,—it is impossible to define the true position or importance of any modern composer. When a composer, relying on the consciousness of personal ability and creative genius, presents a claim for recognition, the public ultimatum is based upon the relation of his art and personality to the art and personality of Richard Wagner. This standard of adjustment has lessened the claims of many highly gifted musicians; arbitrary and independent artistic tem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peraments suffering under the enforced comparison. Anton Rubinstein affords a markedly sad example of this subordination. In the beginning of his career he was neglected and unappreciated; yet, but for the overpowering Wagnerian current forcing common opinion into a circumscribed channel, his mature works would undoubtedly have received recognition as those of a great leader. It was not granted to Rubinstein to develop his fine overflowing talent in accordance with foreign principles. He was thus driven to live within himself for an entire lifetime with an intensity untouched by the influential activity of Wagner, which he regarded with animosity and bitterness; untouched because his own musical nature had a totally different aim, and with animosity since he saw his blossoms of melody cruelly torn and scattered by the Wagnerian hurricane. Rubinstein followed the pure ideal of beauty felt, not formulated, much less to be paragraphed as in the announcements of a programme.

The conditions are now unfavorable for the apostles of absolute musical beauty: the time demands fact and a programme; it calls for a Wagner or a Berlioz, as in literature it demands a Zola, an Ibsen, or a Tolstoi. Rubinstein is rooted in the lyric, which cannot assume the offensive nor be powerful in propaganda. Its influence is contemplative, without power of persuasion, or intrusiveness; and in the tumult of the modern intellectual struggle its position cannot be maintained. The tragic element in Rubinstein's life as a composer lay in the fact that he was from conviction a lyrist, while he strove for the laurels of the dramatist. Withheld from the theatres solely by his conscience, he would not turn, although frequently reaching the true dramatic spirit, even if more by construction than by native impulse. The difference between his fundamental nature and the dramatic heights toward which he strove was clearly indicated; a divergence which, emphasized in the fate of his works of which none has maintained a position in grand-opera repertory, embittered the later years of his life.

We possess documentary proof that Rubinstein cherished deep in his heart a peculiar aversion to the opera in every form, while devoting himself to it with the energy of the most ambitious artist. Undoubtedly this distaste was felt when, in 1891, he published his "Theoretical Legacy." In this work, Rubinstein maintains the absolute supremacy of pure instrumental music, rejects all vocal melody, and speaks in harsh criticism of the opera as "a subordinate order of music." There is reason to believe that twenty or thirty years earlier Rubinstein considered this subject with less severity. He could scarcely have held

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the opera as subordinate at that period, when he was giving the world the delightful melodies of the "Maccabees." On the first nights of "Feramors" and the "Demon," when the dead notes of the score sprang into life, he could not have experienced the force of the views he has bequeathed us. The enthusiasm he formerly evinced for expanded oratorio and sacred opera does not accord with his later attacks upon the opera in general. Every line of his later polemic, if accepted, could be used in argument against the Biblical composition with which Rubinstein's muse stood in such intimate connection. A significant picture is here recalled of the Director Anton Rubinstein before the powerful chorus of his sacred opera, "The Tower of Babel"; his long hair fluttering in the air, while every nerve in his body trembled under the overwhelming sensation of the sound of his own music. Could he have then reflected, "Here I stand the advocate of a subordinate variety of music"? Was he not rather overpowered by the sound of his individual creation and the sentiment of soaring as on eagle wings to the very zenith of art?

True, the earlier wonderful triumph of Rubinstein's operas, secular and sacred, has not reaped the enduring success prophesied, and which he anticipated for them. While catchy ballads of inferior composers hold their own on the stage, his divine "Feramors" has disappeared. Thersites has outlived Patroclus. The public, especially in Germany, has dismissed the composer Rubinstein with truly Platonic homage. *In abstracto* it honors him; but it erects no altars, and denies him the sacrifice. We have, however, an explanation, plausible if not fully satisfactory; *i. e.*, the celebrity of Rubinstein the performer has obscured the fame of Rubinstein the composer. The incomparable virtuoso excited too powerful a personal interest to allow his great creations an equal assertion. The majority of his more difficult works have met a common fate; kindling at the outset a splendid blaze of enthusiasm, which was as speedily to be extinguished. Hardly would the faithful Rubinstein enthusiasts now suffice to fill a single theatre.

The great majority, on whom depends the durability of similar work, continued reservedly indifferent; rejecting not only in the concrete, but with a certain distrust of the composer who witnessed himself obscured by his own brilliant virtuosity. The wide and ever-widening circles spared their laurels only to heap them repeatedly on the incomparable interpreter of the piano,—the singer and thunderer of the concert-room. In large measure Rubinstein, with his leonine hands on the keys, killed his success as a composer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The reaction was not wanting. To the world's injustice he responded by another whose motive was as old as that of the fox and the grapes. Weary at last of the mistress so long unsuccessfully wooed, he made a list of her defects and nailed to the door of the Temple this thesis: "The human voice establishes limitations for melody which do not govern the instrument. A truly free, imaginative, and melodious development is only possible with pure instrumentation. The words of the text, however beautifully phrased, cannot express the overflow of sentiment; they rather hinder an artistic revelation of the emotions. Vocal composers may be compared to those who, with the right to answer set questions, are not privileged to question or express an opinion. These are servitors: instrumental composers, on the contrary, are lords and masters." Such was the conclusion Rubinstein arrived at as the theoretical result of a long career in the composition of operas, cantatas, and songs.

The case stands completely isolated in the entire history of music. No other master has been urged to a similar self-condemnation and exposure of his holiest possessions. In every case, without exception, the reverse has been true. So long as there have been artists, each has accorded to his particular branch of art the most extraordinary attributes: doubting perchance his own gift, he has never doubted art itself, which is supreme. Form—the high altar—is enduring. In Rubinstein, art first experienced opposition in the serving-priest to the divinity: the world sinning against him, he sought to be avenged. Here is a paralogism as fatal as it is unique. Rubinstein, justly and deeply imbued with the greatness of his talent as a composer, and seeing himself by a thousand proofs the favorite of the public,—even while that public deserted him,—sought for the reason of this and sought in vain; and, since any explanation was preferable to none, he finally accused Form itself,—that vocal Form which was unable to assume or express the unutterable emotions striving within him.

Against Rubinstein the accuser, however, there is no better defender than Rubinstein the composer. He conceived no greater melody than that of "Es blinkt der Thau," with which he answered the desire of the poet for the beauty of spring. Or take the first chorus in the "Maccabees," where the composer undoubtedly followed the compulsion of his thought. We admire in this chorus a miraculous melody; and it would seem (were even a more careful scanning of the verse necessary to fully liberate such melody) that the natural artist attains his freest utterance only when under the stimulus of criti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal impulse. The text, instead of proving an obstacle to Rubinstein, was throughout his life of the greatest assistance to him. Had the mentioned forms been present only to give expression to melodious emotions, Rubinstein had been as popular as his music—with that of Gounod and Verdi—is the richest in melody of modern times.

Rubinstein's many failures rest in the fact that no modern opera, however productive the lyric, can be sustained without a dramatic and highly interesting action. In this he was not favored; for, although his librettos were never really indifferent, they provoked a greater interest among composers than among the audiences of the opera-houses of Western Europe. The "Maccabees," his most important work, bears the reproach of dramatical insufficiency; having more the character of a sacred chorus. The "Demon" is permeated with a specific Russian mysticism unintelligible to the West. The "Nero" repels every audience by its fearful cruelty. "Feramors" dissolves in lyric eloquence without the solid core of a stronger action; and the "Kinder der Heide" has scarcely been attempted outside Russia.

His oratorios and cantatas have practically suffered from the curiously uncertain character imparted to them. Originally intended for a "sacred opera-house," planned but never realized by Rubinstein, only one of these works, the "Christ," was placed upon the stage in Bremen, and then only after the death of the author. The others remain subject to the favor or rejection of musical societies, who rarely remember the exceeding wealth and depth here hidden.

As the musician revealed in his symphonies, chamber-music, and pianoforte compositions, Rubinstein is however destined to attain a greater recognition. His personality as a composer appreciably increases the farther we remove from dramatic music. The simple song, free of scenic or oratorial effect, marks for Rubinstein the beginning of a genuine and presumably enduring success. He richly repaid his debt to the pianoforte. The impetuosity and nervous haste of his nature, characteristic of the composer, appear throughout his compositions; occasionally hurrying him on to some anticipated passage to the injury of the inspiration. Careful revision was not his specialty. Much of his work, materially developing the finest architectural form, retains a primitive Cyclopean character. This is true of some of his most famous work; for example, the fifth pianoforte concerto in E sharp, and the "Ocean Symphony," among his orchestral compositions. Rubinstein demonstrates the power of his concentrated attention in the "Dramatic Symphony," which, with all its solemnity, is an extraor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dinary composition of austere vigor and rich conception. The proper relations in development, structure, and gradation are maintained; and each instrument in the orchestra receives a just valuation. In the "Dramatic Symphony" Rubinstein has indeed erected a *monumentum ære perennius.*

It is quite natural to draw a parallel between Rubinstein and Johannes Brahms since Brahms's whole activity until now has been based on the thesis of Rubinstein. A comparison is possible, however, only in so far as the primal incentive of both was derived from the pianoforte, and from the fact that the compositions of the two masters present many features of romanticism indicative of Robert Schumann as their common model. From this point the divergence is great, in fact very great. Rubinstein, continuously manifesting his individuality, remains highly subjective; while Brahms, by a more strictly intellectual method, has attained a truly classic objectivity. Appreciating the commanding position occupied by Brahms in the musical world to-day, we revert instinctively to the prophetic declaration with which Robert Schumann, twenty-two years ago, introduced this genius to public attention as the future Messiah of music. Brahms had already, in his twenty-first year, published his first quartettes, songs, and sonatas, from which Schumann predicted that one had arisen who was to "give full expression to the highest ideals of the time"; in whom supremacy was not to unfold gradually, but who, like Minerva springing from the head of Jupiter, would appear fully grown and armed. The form Schumann perceived on the horizon was not Richard Wagner, who, with the "Faust" overture, the "Flying Dutchman," and "Tannhäuser," already stood in the arena, but Johannes Brahms. "When he shall direct his magic wand where masses of chorus and orchestra shall lend him their forces, still more wonderful glimpses of the spirit-world will be revealed to us. May the highest genius strengthen him thereto! His contemporaries salute him on his course, where, possibly, reverses, but also laurel wreaths and palms await him!" So spoke the memorable oracle; and in many respects time has verified the utterance,—but not in all. The prediction of success has indeed been fulfilled; the name of Brahms has become recognized as one of might and power throughout the musical world, and is not infrequently mentioned with the reverent homage accorded to that of Johann Sebastian Bach; but to "give full expression to the highest ideals of the time" was not allotted to him, but to those mightier ones whose full power Schumann neither foresaw nor recognized.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have here a further example of the alternation of critical defence with fanaticism, of which mention has already been made in connection with Richard Wagner. During the Wagnerian conflict the musical world became divided into two camps; experiencing not only the necessity of argument, but of a positive creed and the possession of opposing heroes belonging to each alone. He who was not a Wagnerian was a sworn follower of Brahms. The identical bigotry governing the cult of Bayreuth characterized the academic Brahms-guard, until in the musical arena was enacted again the historical spectacle of the rival Popes.

To define my present point of view it may be said that at that period I refused to see in Brahms a Beethoven *redivivus*, but after twenty years' study of Brahms's work my judgment is clearer and partially justified. Yet even to-day the majority of his symphonies afford me more admiration than enjoyment. The striking contrast between the celebrity of this master's works in their totality and the relative unpopularity of some of the most profound among them inspires me with surprise. The notes and not the title create the fame of a work; and much will be found in his chamber-music and vocal compositions to render Brahms famous. But how do the greater allied compositions stand, to which universal applause has been rendered,—the symphonies in D sharp, F sharp, and E minor, with the piano concerto and the double concerto for violin and violoncello? Do these particular works, heard and applauded by the world, remain firmly fixed in the memory of the applauders? I believe not. Whereas the themes and motives of Beethoven and Mozart are so well known as to render their indication easy, it is seldom the case with Brahms. After frequent test of the enthusiastic admirers of Brahms, I have commonly found the memory at fault. The attentive listener receives a general impression, but no definite melody to take away with him: he retains the coloring; but the contour is indistinct. The spirit animating these works remains forever remote, and touches no vibrating chord of human passion. In an unremitting endeavor to unveil the profoundest mysteries of art, and seeking its uttermost expression, Brahms overreaches his own power. Reassured by his adherents he also reached the conclusion that his mission was to continue the life-work of Beethoven, whose "Ninth Symphony" he followed by an attempt to write a "Tenth" and an "Eleventh"; but, with the greatest exercise of his musical knowledge, his inspiration has been unequal to the task. Much of his work is labored, rarely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

combining both the remarkable and pleasing in a single passage. It is, however, the privilege of every artist to be his own judge; hence my endeavor is to define the position of this master from a purely objective standpoint. He must be considered as the most celebrated of all living composers, as the most intellectually prominent in the direct line of descent from Beethoven, with whom the similarity of artistic conception—the resultant of an intense absorption and concentration—is often most striking. His position in every department of music—with the exception of the opera, which he never attempted—is indeed supreme; his talent for combination, as his variations testify, is extraordinary. If his polyphonic works are at times unsympathetic, they yet remain an inexhaustible mine of wealth. Viewed in his totality we see in him a musician who, combining the highest order of intelligence with an iron will, has created a special style. This style, sweeping us not infrequently into wild and sterile regions with misty, icy peaks, never touching the prosaic or commonplace, has yet its mission to fulfil in lighting perchance the future part of some disciple to whom will be revealed the radiant heights of Parnassus. And Brahms is still actively at work among us.

Formerly the career of an artist in his sixtieth year was regarded as practically finished; from him the world could expect no more. But the experience of recent years has disturbed this conclusion. The Olympian exhilaration, which, after a life productive of pathetic and tragic music, inspired Verdi to give "Falstaff" to the world, may yet descend upon Brahms. The way of the modern composer may not be foretold. Gounod, whose music glows with sensuality, becomes in his old age a writer of psalms. Wagner, the impetuous and daring, closed his life's labors by the liturgical tones of "Parsifal." The "immutability of character" maintained by Schopenhauer cannot be applied to the composer. Brahms, conducted into the Elysian fields by his own future symphonies, may still wield a light and buoyant sceptre over a joyous and sensuous melody.

ALEXANDER MOSZKOWSKI.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS PARALYZING TO BUSINESS.

THE abnormal and depressing conditions which have prevailed in nearly every department of business in this country within the past four years, is a subject that cannot fail to interest all thoughtful people. The disturbing influences of these unfortunate conditions have been widespread, and have made themselves felt, in greater or less degree, in almost every household throughout the land. Hardly any branch of legitimate business has been conducted with the possibility of profit; and the consequent necessity for economical management has resulted in throwing large numbers of people out of their customary employment. Reduced earnings of the industrial classes have necessitated the rigid curtailment of expenditures, and have thus materially narrowed the volume of business in the general staples of ordinary trade; while traffic in objects of luxury has fallen to insignificant proportions. The widely extended prevalence of these extraordinary circumstances over all our broad domain indicates a common cause of remarkable potency.

Recent publication of data collated by the Bradstreet Mercantile Agency shows that 11,200 commercial failures occurred in the United States during the first nine months of 1896. This is a much greater number of business disasters than occurred in the same months of any previous year, save only 1893, when the failures for the corresponding period were about 11,000. Thus we have suffered two of the most disastrous business years in all our history within three years of each other; while the intermediate years have been a period of extreme depression in the management of commercial affairs. This unfortunate experience renders it desirable to make serious inquiry as to the cause, and to consider whether there may not be some safeguards devisable that will serve to render the recurrence of like periods of disaster less frequent in the future. The manifest importance of the subject certainly demands that it shall have serious consideration, and, if possible, the adoption of such remedial policy as may appear fairly promising of beneficent results.

Considerable diversity of opinion has been expressed by different authorities as to the real origin of the great monetary disturbances and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commercial crisis of 1893. If not wholly caused by the results of the Presidential and Congressional elections of 1892, it cannot be successfully denied that their severity and duration were greatly aggravated by those events. Industrial activities were suddenly checked, in apprehension of tariff legislation the extent of which could not possibly be estimated. The election of President Cleveland as the avowed champion of tariff reform, and the restoration of the Democratic party to Congressional control—after an interval of more than thirty years, —on a platform demanding radical tariff revision, created what may well be called a manufacturers' panic. The financial condition of the Government had already been seriously weakened by the operation and influence of the improvident silver-purchasing law; and the sudden reduction of the public revenue served to precipitate a monetary convulsion of extraordinary proportions.

Prompt and effective measures of relief were imperatively required; but instead of the necessary remedial action came procrastination with apparent indifference, both on the part of the Executive and of Congress. The Treasury reserve was rapidly depleted; and the Government was forced repeatedly to resort to the sale of bonds in order to provide means for current expenditures. Unwise and ineffective legislation, tardily enacted, only served to continue the period of stagnation in all business affairs. Deficiencies in the public revenues constantly increased the public debt; and confidence was continually strained. This discouraging situation remained without substantial mitigation until the approach of the succeeding Presidential canvass. The country was then plunged into another rigor of apprehension, by the violent agitation of the silver issue. Grave fears of further monetary disturbances were caused by the demand of the Democratic platform for the free and unlimited coinage of silver by our Government, independently of foreign coöperation, upon a basis that would manifestly have created another financial crisis. Acute industrial paralysis followed, with the alarming results indicated by the foregoing record of commercial failures. Business of all kinds continued in a state of almost total suspension throughout the entire period of the political campaign, which was finally and happily ended by the November election.

The complete restoration of confidence in commercial circles and the active resumption of industrial operations so promptly following the result of the recent Presidential election have been quite remarkable, and altogether unprecedented in our experience. These notable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

results afford abundant substantiation of the assumption that the real cause of the most recent business disturbances was serious anticipation of the possible success of the revolutionary demand for the free coinage of silver, and the consequent debasement of the national currency. Nearly four years of commercial and industrial prostration have been endured in consequence of apprehension; first, of anticipated tariff legislation, and, later, of the possible success of the silver agitation. Relief from this prolonged and tiresome period of business depression finally came, at the close of the recent national election, with all the celerity of the electric impulse which conveyed the welcome intelligence of the popular verdict. Instantly flashed forth orders for the early resumption of long-suspended industries, by which hundreds of thousands of waiting and eager wage-earners were promptly employed in renewed activities of every description.

Assuming that the experiences of the past four years resulted from, or at least were aggravated by, uncertainty regarding political results, it is evident that effective remedial measures must be sought in the direction of allaying, so far as possible, the disturbing influence of political events upon the vital commercial interests of the country. Obviously the first condition to be attained is greater stability in governmental affairs, and less frequent and irritating changes in legislation affecting the tariff and finances. Our country has now become an immense home of manufacturing industry, and, consequently, requires, as the necessary condition of continuous prosperity, longer periods of industrial tranquillity and freedom from oft recurring seasons of political turmoil. Vast numbers of industrious people are dependent for their livelihood upon the successful operation of manufacturing establishments, which can only rely upon being profitably conducted during continued periods of business stability. Wage-earners cannot find steady employment unless the products of their labor can be satisfactorily marketed. The interests of both labor and capital are, therefore, mutual in the necessity for the continuance of long periods of commercial and industrial activity.

The primary and apparently the most prolific cause of our present political instability is believed to reside in our too frequently recurring Presidential elections. When our patriotic fathers, with all their profound wisdom, framed the Constitution and projected the form of our National Government, four years seemed an appropriate term of official service for the President. With them it was wholly a question of experiment; and they determined it in accordance with their best judg-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. Only political interests seemed then to be involved, as there were no great industries in existence likely to be injuriously affected by changes of administration. But the country, through its wonderful development, has apparently outgrown the limit of their distant view. Evidently it has now become a question worthy serious consideration, whether the time has not already arrived for a readjustment of our Constitutional provisions relative to the executive administration of the Government. It is not unreasonable to presume that, with the advantage of experience and suitable consideration of the changed conditions, amendments can be made that will render the Constitution more useful and make its operations more in harmony with our present political and material necessities.

Within the hundred years that have elapsed since the adoption of our National Constitution and the organization of the Federal Government, wonderful changes have occurred in our political and material conditions and commercial necessities. From a meagre and industrious population of three millions, sparsely scattered along the Atlantic coast, principally occupied in agricultural pursuits, we have now become a rich, powerful, and rapidly growing nation of more than seventy millions, engaged in all the activities of industrial enterprise known to civilization; possessing and occupying, in course of rapid development, a continental domain of wonderful fertility and fabulous mineral resources. Our unrivalled system of public schools and our printing-presses have stimulated and cultivated the intellectual faculties of our people into a marvellous mental activity; while the railroad and telegraph have increased their capacity for the conduct of business pursuits beyond that of any other race of men.

Fertility of ingenious invention and superior capacity in business organization, developed under the powerful stimulus of vast accumulations of wealth invested in manufacturing plants of various kinds, have enabled our people to attain a facility and capability of production, in many branches of industry, far beyond the limits of present ordinary demand. One of our greatest necessities now is to promote a greater diversity of labor and thus to provide for the increased employment of willing workers. Enhancement of the earning power of the industrial classes is the surest attainable mode of enlarging the consuming power of our home markets; thus promoting in the highest possible degree the general prosperity of all our people.

Longer continued periods of uninterrupted business tranquillity are extremely desirable, and indeed indispensable, for the safe devel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opment of a diversified industrial progress. These conditions can be securely attained only by increased exemption from unnecessary political agitation. This desirable result can be promoted with the greatest certainty by extending the length of the Presidential term, in order to prolong the period of political quietude between the recurring Presidential campaigns. The first and last years of every National Administration are naturally seasons of political activity; so that, under a term of four years, barely two years of quiet can be expected. If the Presidential term were lengthened to six years, we might fairly anticipate at least four years of continuous exemption from political strife. The longer intervals of political tranquillity between the Presidential campaigns could not fail to be promotive of conditions favorable to the conservative development of business enterprise in all departments of industrial activity.

Extension of the Presidential term should, by all means, be accompanied by a provision rendering the President ineligible for reëlection to an immediately succeeding term. This would manifestly be an important step toward the mitigation of one of our most serious political evils. Under existing conditions and precedents it is presumed, whether true or not, that every newly elected President is constantly planning for reëlection; and every official act is liable to be the subject of popular suspicion in this regard. Relieved from this serious discredit, as he would be under the changed conditions proposed, the President would become much more directly influential in his official capacity than he could possibly be under present circumstances. Thus, freed from actual or suspected manipulation of political forces to promote the chances of his own reëlection, he would be relieved from many present embarrassments, and have more time and much greater opportunity to see that the laws were appropriately enforced. To the great advantage of the public service, the President would become the responsible business head of the Government, instead of continuing to serve simply as a political almoner, as has too often been the case in times past.

Congress has quite outgrown the limit placed upon it by the Constitution, and imperatively needs relief from the congested condition in which it exists. It is a notorious fact that the pressure of business has become so serious as almost to prevent the consideration of private bills; and monstrous wrong is constantly being suffered by many persons having just claims for relief. Aside from the Government appropriation bills, and other bills having preference under the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rules, it is almost impossible for any measure, however meritorious, to make progress or even to receive creditable attention, if seriously antagonized. For many years no adjournment of Congress has found its business completed to any reasonable degree of satisfaction; while the number of bills failing to receive a reasonable degree of consideration is rapidly increasing with each succeeding year. The only practical remedy for relieving this deplorable condition is to extend the length of the Congressional term from two years to either three or four.

Supposing the Presidential term to be lengthened to six years, as herein proposed, members of the House of Representatives should be elected for a period of three years. Thus there would be, as at present, two full terms of Congress within the limit of each Presidential term. The official service of each new Congress should also be made to commence within a reasonable time of the election of the members, instead of being postponed, for the first regular session, for more than a year following the election, as is now the case. Thus, the voice of the people, as expressed through their ballots, would become potent, and receive more prompt and considerate attention. The practice of permitting the old Congress to conduct the legislation of the country for a whole year after the election of their successors is a relic of early days which should speedily be dispensed with.

Owing to the continuous character of the Senate in the constitution of its membership, no change would be required to conform it to the suggested longer term of the Presidency and House of Representatives. Such a prolongation of the official term of Congress would obviously afford very material relief from the existing pressure of legislation; all of which would inure to the advantage of the people at large, and especially to the benefit of many who are suffering from the neglect of worthy measures. Moreover, the proposed change could not fail to be in the direction of more careful and considerate treatment of the details of legislation. The present practice of rushing through, by unanimous consent, bills when not antagonized is an especially objectionable mode of legislation, worthy of the most strenuous condemnation.

Objection to a longer Presidential term will perhaps be made on the ground that if an unsatisfactory President should be chosen it would take a long time to get rid of him. A review of our past history and reasonable consideration of the character and services of our Presidents, do not substantiate this view as a valid obstacle to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proposed change. The objection certainly would not offset the advantage of relief from the present eligibility of the President for reelection. The lengthening of the interval between the disturbing influences of the recurring Presidential campaigns, resulting from the addition of two years to each Administration, would certainly outweigh all objections of this character. Whatever would tend to minimize the present evil of the political disturbance of business affairs could not fail to prove advantageous to the country at large.

Having rendered the President ineligible for immediate reëlection, a very wise and appropriate as well as graceful provision could be adopted, appointing all retired Presidents members of the Senate for life. We should thus continue to the public service the benefit of their eminent characters and great experience, and at the same time maintain by congenial association their official distinction and importance. The number of past Presidents could never be large enough to prove objectionable; and their presence in the Senate could not fail to add to the dignity and usefulness of that august body. Furthermore, it would remedy what is now frequently spoken of as a matter of reproach, viz., that in our public life there is no useful and congenial sphere of service for one who has occupied the chief executive office of the nation.

Propositions for extending the length of the official term of the President and making him ineligible for immediate reëlection have repeatedly been introduced into one or the other houses of Congress, but they have never made progress beyond the stage of abstract debate. The subject seems especially worthy of renewed consideration at this time, in view of the forcible illustration our recent experience has afforded of the necessity of increased exemption from political agitation. Deliberate consideration of the cruel and needless disturbance of commercial affairs experienced in this country during the past four years cannot fail to convince any unprejudiced mind of the pressing necessity of removing, so far as possible, the elements of future occurrences of similar character. What other remedy can be suggested that will promise more effectual chances of relief from the dangers of recurring disasters than the lengthening of the intervals between each Presidential election?

To avoid every complication of personal consideration, the date when the amended Constitutional provisions suggested above should take effect and become operative should be fixed far enough ahead to avoid interference with the presumptive right of President McKinley to reëlection, in accordance with the precedents of our history. Even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under the most favorable progress which such a measure could naturally command, it could hardly be expected to reach maturity in time for the election of 1900; so that probably the proper date for the contemplated change would be 1904. This would afford ample time for the suitable and dignified consideration of a proposition so vitally affecting the framework of our Constitutional fabric.

Although the unfortunate commercial disturbances of the past four years are assumed to have been mainly caused, or at least greatly augmented in severity and duration, by the influence of political apprehension, it by no means follows that such influences are regarded as the sole or even the main cause of business disaster. Such occurrences have their origin in a diversity of causes, which may have no relation to political events or to political influences. It has, however, been quite apparent in recent years that the frequent recurrence of prolonged periods of political activity was liable to produce disturbing and depressing influences of greater or less severity upon the business interests of the country. These facts, together with the clearly defined origin of our recent disturbances, have therefore seemed to justify the propriety of the suggestions herein made.

Consideration of these subjects should be entirely free from political bias or party prejudice. Only the highest interests of the whole people should be regarded in the treatment of the questions involved. The object of this article has been to make an entirely fair and impartial presentation of facts and arguments deemed pertinent and indispensable to the intelligent discussion of the matter. If it be admitted that our recent commercial disturbances have been caused by the political influences suggested, there can hardly be room to doubt that the remedy proposed would be well worth adopting; even though it served to prevent the repetition of similar disasters but a single time in the next hundred years.

ALONZO B. CORNELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WANTON DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN PROPERTY IN CUBA.

THE story of Cuba, as reported by the press, is a conflicting statement of glorious victories claimed by both parties. But, while other points remain in doubt, authenticity of the accounts of the burning of plantations and farms has been established beyond question. Many provinces of the island have been absolutely wasted; and the work of destruction is energetically going on. It has even been announced, as a grand exhibition of patriotism, that the insurgents will sacrifice everything rather than have the Spaniards succeed, and will leave them a heap of ashes as the prize of victory.

It is to be noted, however, in regard to this patriotic resolve that very little, if any, of the property destroyed belongs to the insurgents. The plantations belong to people who, save in a very few cases, have not joined the revolution. In fact, either directly, or through the equity of money owed, the citizens of the United States are probably the greatest sufferers. From the proximity of Cuba, and the fact that we are by far the greatest consumers of its products, American capital has been one of the greatest factors in its development. Many plantations belong to Americans; and debts, created by advances to make the sugar crops, have made them the owners of a still greater number. It is Americans who, in the majority of cases, are really the victims.

But there is a still more serious result. Engaged in the insurgent army there are perhaps 50,000 men. Of the remaining million and a half of inhabitants, nothing is told. Of their misery, of their poverty, of their actual starvation, no mention is made. The industries of Cuba are entirely agricultural: nearly the entire population is engaged in the cultivation of the soil. The sugar plantations employ, directly or indirectly, the bulk of the working classes, and by far the greater part of the capital invested. The other large products are tobacco and cattle. With the exception of the cigar factories in Havana, there is nothing manufactured in the island; even the small industries of the cities and their commerce are dependent upon the sugar and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tobacco crops. The terrible suffering resulting from the absolute stoppage of all agricultural pursuits can be readily imagined. When great calamities have come to other nations, it has been possible for the rich classes to assist their poorer neighbors. In the present case, the planters, beyond all others, have been injured—in fact, ruined. To the impossibility of obtaining employment must be added the enormous rise in all the necessaries of life, owing to the destruction or abandonment of the small farms all over the island. Hence, whatever may be the dangers and privations of the men in the insurgent army, the real sufferers are the very great number of the inhabitants who must remain at home, unoccupied, helpless, and called upon to face the slow misery of starvation.

The price being paid to secure the independence of the island is thus a very great one, and it falls most heavily on those who have no control over the course of events; for the condition of the peaceful population is infinitely worse than that of the men in the insurgent armies, as starvation comes to the latter only after there is nothing left for them to take.

The responsibility of the insurgent leaders is, therefore, a very great one. So much human suffering cannot justifiably be incurred without either the consent of those who must bear the burden, or the certainty of the ability to succeed. And the mere exclusion of the Spaniards from Cuba is not in itself a sufficient result. The insurgent leaders must provide a government that will be able to correct the evils from which the country is suffering. It must be remembered, too, that the evils of Spanish rule in Cuba are not the physical cruelties of Alva in Holland.

Is there any possibility of such a government growing from this foundation of destruction and desolation? The Latin races in this continent have shown a distinct incapacity for self-government. The history of the several republics that have succeeded Spanish rule has been one of constant revolutions and disorders, with interludes of despotism; such as the rule of Blanco in Venezuela, or of Barrios in Guatemala. In Cuba the difficulties would be even greater, owing to the presence of the large negro element. The danger of this domination has always been felt by the white leaders in the insurrection. It was one of the causes that brought to an end the previous revolution. Should the Spanish inhabitants of the island emigrate,—as many of them undoubtedly would, should the insurgents succeed,—the two races would be nearly equal in number. The Cuban negro is a much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

later importation and is therefore much less civilized than his brother in this country. Many of them came from warlike tribes. The mulatto element is intelligent and ambitious. For years a negro republic, to include Cuba, St. Domingo, and Jamaica, the so-called Republic of the Antilles, has been spoken of. Without a great preponderance, it would be impossible for the whites to control this element. The same favorable conditions—the warm climate, the impenetrable forests, the abundance of food,—that favor the present uprising would render the suppression of revolt and the maintenance of order difficult if not impossible. From all indications, the future of the island under a native government would be even less favorable to our interests than under the present one.

The suppression of the insurrection by the Spanish is improbable, and can be achieved only by the slow process of exhaustion of their opponents. Everything tends to show that the official class has in every way clogged any real effort to bring the conflict to an end. No other explanation of the ineffectiveness of the immense force now under arms is possible. The expenditure of the one hundred millions, which the war is costing the Spanish government annually, affords opportunities for colossal peculation and opportunities for fortunes which are irresistible. It is only when spurred by public opinion in Spain that any serious effort to suppress the insurrection is made.

It is apparent therefore that a return of order and prosperity to Cuba can be secured only by annexation to the United States. But, with the present temper of the Spanish people, such a result would be most difficult, if not impossible. While the official class in Spain recognizes the fact that Cuba is only a source of weakness to the mother country, the patriotic pride of the people would wreak its vengeance on any party that might sanction the cession of the island. But, could Cuba be purchased, the advantages to this country would be enormous. A vast field for American enterprise and capital would be opened up. The island would easily produce not only all the sugar we consume but, in a few years, all the coffee. The cession of Cuba would also remove the large balance of trade against us, incurred by the purchase of these articles; for it would open a market for at least a hundred millions of our products.

The opposition to our acquisition of the island has been based on two grounds: (1) the increase in the undesirable foreign element; and (2) want of any means of governing a colony by the United States.

In regard to the first objection, it is to be said that we are now

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

receiving annually half a million of foreigners, a large proportion of whom are much less favorable in character than the inhabitants of Cuba.

As regards the second objection, we governed Louisiana in the form of a colony at a time when, proportionately to our population, its inhabitants were much more numerous than the Cubans are to-day; and no great difficulties would arise in Cuba, for no party in the island could afford to antagonize a great power like the United States. Very soon, as in California and Louisiana, the Anglo-Saxon race would establish its supremacy. The annexation of Cuba, however, can only be hoped for; and its advisability would depend on whether the island could be obtained through negotiation.

There is, however, a manifest duty devolving upon the Government of the United States; viz., to prevent, in every possible way, the wanton destruction of property. It has been claimed by the leaders of the revolution that the stoppage of the production of sugar was a military necessity, as the Spaniards were thereby prevented from obtaining any revenue from the island. But as the absolute cessation of the payment of taxes could only cause a loss of twenty-six millions to the Spanish government, while the cost of the war is stated to be one hundred millions a year, it is obvious that the funds for the struggle are being provided entirely from resources outside Cuba. The destruction of the sugar crops has therefore worked an injury that has fallen entirely on Cubans and Americans who own the plantations. But the destruction of the machinery and of farms, the burning of villages and towns, can have no excuse whatever. These are not military necessities, but in most cases arise from a system of extortion practised by the lesser chiefs of the insurgents, who demand money in return for protection. Another cause is the number of negroes and other utterly irresponsible persons to whom destruction and pillage are only mere excitement. In the interests, then, not only of humanity but of our own citizens,—whose losses, it is said, have already reached fifty million dollars,—this wanton destruction of property should cease; and upon our Government and people rests the duty of ending it. It is natural for Americans to sympathize with a gallant struggle for independence; but real liberty can only exist with order.

At a time when the insurgent leaders are asking so many favors, it would be easy to obtain at least some modification of their policy of destruction, which should be made to conform to the rules of civilized warfare. The misfortune of so many helpless people should certainly enlist the sympathies of Americans. FERNANDO A. YZNAGA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LAW OF CIVILIZATION AND DECAY.

FEW more powerful and more melancholy books have been written than Mr. Brooks Adams's "Law of Civilization and Decay."[1] For one thing, it is a marvel of compressed statement. In a volume of less than four hundred pages he singles out some of the vital factors in the growth and evolution of civilized life during the last two thousand years; and so brilliant is his discussion of these factors as to give, though but a glimpse, yet the most vivid glimpse ever given, of some of the most important features in the world-life of Christendom. Of some of the features only; for the defective point in Mr. Adams's brilliant book is his failure to present certain phases of the life of the nations,—phases which are just as important as those which he discusses with such vigorous ability. Furthermore, he disregards not a few facts which would throw light on others, the weight of which he fully recognizes. Both these shortcomings are very natural in a writer who possesses an entirely original point of view, who is the first man to see clearly things that to his predecessors have been nebulous, and who writes with a fervent intensity of conviction, even in his bitterest cynicism, such as we are apt to associate rather with the prophet and reformer than with a historian to whom prophet and reformer alike appeal no more than do their antitypes. It is a rare thing for a historian to make a distinct contribution to the philosophy of history; and this, Mr. Adams has done. Naturally enough, he, like other men who break new ground, tends here and there to draw a devious furrow.

The book is replete with vivid writing, and with sentences and paragraphs which stand out in the memory as marvels in the art of presenting the vital features of a subject with a few master-strokes. The story of the crusades, the outline of the English conquest of India, and the short tale of the rise of the house of Rothschild, are masterpieces. Nowhere else is it possible to find in the same compass any description of the crusades so profound in its appreciation of the motives behind them, so startling in the vigor with which the chief

[1] "The Law of Civilization and Decay." By BROOKS ADAMS. New York: The Macmillan Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actors, and the chief events, are portrayed. Indeed, one is almost tempted to say that it is in the description of the crusades that Mr. Adams is at his best. He is dealing with a giant movement of humanity; and he grasps not only the colossal outward manifestations, but also the spirit itself, and above all the strange and sinister changes which that spirit underwent. His mere description of the baronies set up by the crusaders in the conquered Holy Land, with their loose feudal government, brings them before the reader's eyes as few volumes specially devoted to the subject could. It is difficult to write of a fortress and make a pen picture which will always stay in the mind; yet this is what Mr. Adams has done in dealing with the grim religious castles, terrible in size and power, which were built by the Knights of the Temple and the Hospital as bulwarks against Saracen might. He is not only a scholar of profound research, but a student of art, who is so much more than a mere student as to be thrilled and possessed by what he studies. He shows, with a beauty and vigor of style not unbecoming his subject, how profoundly the art of Europe was affected by the crusades. It is not every one who can write with equal interest of sacred architecture and military engineering, who can appreciate alike the marvels of Gothic cathedrals and the frowning strength of feudal fortresses, and who furthermore can trace their inter-relation.

The story of the taking of Constantinople by the crusaders who followed the lead of the blind Doge Dandolo is told with an almost brutal ruthlessness quite befitting the deed itself. Nowhere else in the book is Mr. Adams happier in his insistence upon the conflict between what he calls the economic and the imaginative spirits. The incident sets well with his favorite theory of the inevitable triumph of the economic over the imaginative man, as societies grow centralized, and the no less inevitable fossilization and ruin of the body politic which this very triumph itself ultimately entails. The history of the English conquest of India is only less vividly told. Incidentally it may be mentioned that one of Mr. Adams's many merits is his contemptuous refusal to be misled by modern criticism of Macaulay. He sees Macaulay's great merits as a historian, and his essential truthfulness on many of the very points where he has been most sharply criticized.

Mr. Adams's book, however, is far more than a mere succession of brilliant episodes. He fully sees that the value of facts lies in their relation to one another; and from the facts as he sees them he deduces certain laws with more than a Thucydidean indifference as to his own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual approval or disapproval of the development. The life of nations, like any other form of life, is but one manifestation of energy; and Mr. Adams's decidedly gloomy philosophy of life may be gathered from the fact that he places fear and greed as the two forms of energy which stand conspicuously predominant; fear in the earlier, and greed in the later, stages of evolution from barbarism to civilization. Civilization itself he regards merely as the history of the movement from a condition of physical distribution to one of physical concentration. During the earlier stages of this movement the imaginative man—the man who stands in fear of a priesthood—is, in his opinion, the representative type, while with him and almost equally typical stand the soldier and the artist. As consolidation advances, the economic man—the man of industry, trade, and capital—tends to supplant the emotional and artistic types of manhood, and finally himself develops along two lines,—"the usurer in his most formidable aspect, and the peasant whose nervous system is best adapted to thrive on scanty nutriment." These two very unattractive types are in his belief the inevitable final products of all civilization, as civilization has hitherto developed; and when they have once been produced there follows either a stationary period, during which the whole body politic gradually ossifies and atrophies, or else a period of utter disintegration.

This is not a pleasant theory; but, as Mr. Adams would very truthfully answer, his concern is not whether or not the theory be pleasant, but whether or not it be true. There is in it a very ugly element of truth. One does not have to accept either all his theories or all his facts in order to recognize more than one disagreeable resemblance between the world as it is to-day, and the Roman world under the Empire, or the Greek world under the successors of Alexander. Where he errs is in his failure to appreciate the fundamental differences which utterly destroy any real parallelism between the two sets of cases. Indeed his zeal in championing his theories leads him at times into positions which are seen at a glance to be untenable.

Probably Mr. Adams's account of the English Reformation, and of Henry VIII and his instruments, is far nearer the truth than Froude's. But his view of the evils upon which the reformers as a whole waged war, and of the spirit which lay behind the real leaders and spurred them on, is certainly less accurate than the view given by Froude in his "Erasmus," and "Council of Trent." It can be partly corrected by the study of a much less readable book—Mr. Henry C. Lea's work on "The Inquisition." Yet Mr. Adams's description of the English

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reformation is very powerful, and has in it a vein of bitter truth; though on the whole it is perhaps not so well done as his account of the suppression of the Templars in France. If he can be said to have any heroes, the Templars must certainly be numbered among them.

He is at his best in describing the imaginative man, and especially the imaginative man whose energy manifests itself in the profession of arms. His description of the tremendous change which passed over Europe during the centuries which saw what is commonly called the decay of faith is especially noteworthy. In no other history are there to be found two sentences which portray so vividly the reasons for the triumph of the great Pope Hildebrand over the Emperor Henry as these:

> "To Henry's soldiers the world was a vast space peopled by those fantastic beings which are still seen on Gothic towers. These demons obeyed the monk of Rome, and his army melting from the Emperor under a nameless horror, left him helpless."

His account of the contrast between the relations of Philip Augustus and of Philip the Fair with the Church is dramatic in its intensity. To Mr. Adams, Philip the Fair, even more than Henry VIII, is the incarnation of the economic spirit in its conflict with the Church; and he makes him an even more repulsive, though perhaps an abler, man than Henry. In this he is probably quite right. His account of the hounding down of Boniface, and the cruel destruction of the Templars, is as stirring as it is truthful; but he certainly pushes his theory to an altogether impossible extreme when he states that the moneyed class, the *bourgeoisie*, was already the dominant force in France. The heroes of Froissart still lay in the future; and for centuries to come the burgher was to be outweighed by king, priest, and noble. The economic man, the man of trade and money, was, at that time, in no sense dominant.

That there is grave reason for some of Mr. Adams's melancholy forebodings, no serious student of the times, no sociologist or reformer, and no practical politician who is interested in more than momentary success, will deny. A foolish optimist is only less noxious than an utter pessimist; and the pre-requisite for any effort, whether hopeful or hopeless, to better our conditions is an accurate knowledge of what these conditions are. There is no use in blinding ourselves to certain of the tendencies and results of our high-pressure civilization. Some very ominous facts have become more and more apparent during the present century, in which the social movement of the white race has gone on with such unexampled and ever-accelerating rapidity. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rich have undoubtedly grown richer; and, while the most careful students are inclined to answer with an emphatic negative the proposition that the poor have grown poorer, it is nevertheless certain that there has been a large absolute, though not relative, increase of poverty, and that the very poor tend to huddle in immense masses in the cities. Even though these masses are, relatively to the rest of the population, smaller than they formerly were, they constitute a standing menace, not merely to our prosperity but to our existence. The improvement in the means of communication, moreover, has so far immensely increased the tendency of the urban population to grow at the expense of the rural; and philosophers have usually been inclined to regard the ultimate safety of a nation as resting upon its peasantry. The improvement in machinery, the very perfection of scientific processes, cause great, even though temporary, suffering to unskilled laborers. Moreover, there is a certain softness of fibre in civilized nations which, if it were to prove progressive, might mean the development of a cultured and refined people quite unable to hold its own in those conflicts through which alone any great race can ultimately march to victory. There is also a tendency to become fixed, and to lose flexibility. Most ominous of all, there has become evident, during the last two generations, a very pronounced tendency among the most highly civilized races, and among the most highly civilized portions of all races, to lose the power of multiplying, and even to decrease; so much so as to make the fears of the disciples of Malthus a century ago seem rather absurd to the dweller in France or New England to-day.

Mr. Adams does not believe that any individual or group of individuals can influence the destiny of a race for good or for evil. All of us admit that it is very hard by individual effort thus to make any alteration in destiny, but we do not think it is impossible; and Mr. Adams will have performed a great service if he succeeds in fixing the eyes of the men who ought to know thoroughly the problems set us to solve, upon the essential features of these problems. I do not think his diagnosis of the disease is in all respects accurate. I believe there is an immense amount of healthy tissue as to the existence of which he is blind; but there is disease, and it is serious enough to warrant very careful examination.

It seems, however, as if Mr. Adams was certainly in error in putting the immense importance he does upon the question of the expansion or contraction of the currency. There is no doubt what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever that a nation is profoundly affected by the character of its currency; but there seems to be equally little doubt that the currency is only one, and by no means the most important, among a hundred causes which profoundly affect it. The United States has been on a gold basis, and on a silver basis; it has been on a paper basis, and on a basis of what might be called the scraps and odds and ends of the currencies of a dozen other nations; but it has kept on developing along the same lines no matter what its currency has been. If a change of currency were so enacted as to amount to dishonesty, that is, to the repudiation of debts, it would be a very bad thing morally; or, if a change took place in a manner that would temporarily reduce the purchasing power of the wage-earner, it would be a very bad thing materially; but the current of the national life would not be wholly diverted or arrested, it would merely be checked, even by such a radical change. The forces that most profoundly shape the course of a nation's life lie far deeper than the mere use of gold or of silver, the mere question of the appreciation or depreciation of one metal when compared with the other, or when compared with commodities generally.

Mr. Adams unconsciously shows this in his first and extremely interesting chapter on the Romans. In one part of this chapter he seems to ascribe the ruin of the Roman Empire to the contraction of the currency, saying, "with contraction came that fall of prices which first ruined, then enslaved, and finally exterminated the native rural population of Italy." This he attributes to the growth of the economic or capitalistic spirit. As he puts it, "the stronger type exterminated the weaker, the money-lender killed out the husbandman, the soldiers vanished, and the farms on which they once flourished were left desolate."

But, curiously enough, Mr. Adams himself shows that all this really occurred during the two centuries, or thereabouts, extending from the end of the second Punic war through the reign of the first of the Roman emperors; and this was a period of currency expansion, not of currency contraction. Moreover, it was emphatically a period when the military and not the economic type was supreme. The great Romans of the first and second centuries before Christ were soldiers, not merchants or usurers, and they could only be said to possess the economic instinct incidentally, in so far as it is possessed by every man of the military type who seizes the goods accumulated by the man of the economic type. It was during these centuries,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when the military type was supreme, and when prices were rising, that the ruin, the enslavement, and the extermination of the old rural population of Italy began. It was during these centuries that the husbandmen left the soil and became the mob of Rome, clamoring for free bread and the games of the amphitheatre. It was toward the close of this period that the Roman army became an army no longer of Roman citizens, but of barbarians trained in the Roman manner; it was toward the close of this period that celibacy became so crying an evil as to invoke the vain action of the legislature, and that the Roman race lost the power of self-perpetuation. What happened in the succeeding centuries,—the period of the contraction of the currency and the rise of prices,—was merely the completion of the ruin which had already been practically accomplished.

These facts seem to show clearly that the question of the currency had really little or nothing to do with the decay of the Roman fibre. This decay began under one set of currency conditions, and continued unchanged when these conditions became precisely reversed. An infinitely more important cause, as Mr. Adams himself shows, was the immense damage done to the Italian husbandman by the importation of Asiatic and African slaves; which was in all probability the chief of the causes that conspired to ruin him. He was forced into competition with races of lower vitality; races tenacious of life, who possessed a very low standard of living, and who furnished to the great slave-owner his cheap labor. Mr. Adams shows that the husbandman was affected, not only by the importation of vast droves of slaves to compete with him in Italy, but by the competition with low-class labor in Egypt and elsewhere. These very points, if developed with Mr. Adams's skill, would have enabled him to show in a very striking manner the radical contrast between the present political and social life of civilized states, and the political and social life of Rome during what he calls the capitalistic or closing period. At present, the minute that the democracy becomes convinced that the workman and the peasant are suffering from competition with cheap labor, whether this cheap labor take the form of alien immigration, or of the importation of goods manufactured abroad by low-class working-men, or of commodities produced by convicts, it at once puts a stop to the competition. We keep out the Chinese, very wisely; we have put an end to the rivalry of convict contract labor with free labor; we are able to protect ourselves, whenever necessary, by heavy import duties, against the effect of too cheap labor in any foreign country; and, finally, in the civil war, we utterly destroyed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the system of slavery, which really was threatening the life of the free working-man in a way in which it cannot possibly be threatened by any conceivable development of the "capitalistic" spirit.

Mr. Adams possesses a very intimate knowledge of finance, and there are many of his discussions on this subject into which only an expert would be competent to enter. Nevertheless, on certain financial and economic questions, touching matters open to discussion by the man of merely ordinary knowledge, his terminology seems somewhat vague. This is especially true when he speaks of "the producer." Now the producer, as portrayed by the Populist stump orator or writer of political and economic pamphlets, is a being with whom we became quite intimate during the recent campaign; but we have found it difficult to understand at all definitely who this "producer" actually is. According to one school of Populistic thinkers the farmer is the producer; but according to another and more radical school this is not so, unless the farmer works with his hands and not his head, this school limiting the application of the term "producer" to the working-man who does the immediate manual work of production. On the other hand, those who speak with scientific precision must necessarily class as producers all men whose work results directly or indirectly in production. Under this definition, inventors, and men who improve the methods of transportation, like railway presidents, and men who enable other producers to work, such as bankers who loan money wisely, are all themselves to be classed as producers, and often indeed as producers of the most effective kind.

The great mass of the population consists of producers; and in consequence the majority of the sales by producers are sales to other producers. It requires one set of producers to make a market for any other set of producers; and in consequence the rise or fall of prices is a good or a bad thing for different bodies of producers according to the different circumstances of each case. Mr. Adams says that the period from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth centuries was an interval of "almost unparalleled prosperity," which he apparently ascribes to the expansion of the currency, with which, he says, "went a rise in prices, all producers grew rich, and for more than two generations the strain of competition was so relaxed that the different classes of the population preyed upon each other less savagely than they are wont to do in less happy times." It is not exactly clear how a rise in the prices both of what one producer sells another, and of what he in return buys from that other, can somehow make both of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them rich, and relax the strain of competition. Certainly in the present century, competition has been just as severe in times of high prices; and some of the periods of greatest prosperity have coincided with the periods of very low prices. There is reason to believe that low prices are ultimately of great benefit to the wage-earners. A rise in prices generally injures them. Moreover, in the century of which Mr. Adams speaks, the real non-producers were the great territorial feudal lords and the kings and clergymen; and these were then supreme. It was the period of the ferocious Albigensian crusades. It is true that it ushered in a rather worse period,—that of the struggle between England and France, with its attendant peasant wars and Jacqueries and huge bands of marauding free-companies. But the alteration for the worse was due to a fresh outbreak of "imaginative" spirit; and the first period was full of recurring plagues and famines, besides the ordinary unrest, murder, oppression, pillage, and general corruption. Mr. Adams says that the different classes of the population during that happy time "preyed upon each other less savagely" than at other times. All that can be said in answer is that there is not now a civilized community, under no matter what stress of capitalistic competition, in which the different classes prey upon one another with one-tenth the savagery they then showed; or in which famine and disease, even leaving war out of account, come anywhere near causing so much misery to poor people, and above all to the wage-earners, or working-men, the under strata and base of the producing classes. Yet, while thus disagreeing radically with some of Mr. Adams's positions, I am compelled to admit the power of thought and the beautiful clearness and force of style with which, in the very chapter wherein he discusses the producers, he describes the rise of the great trading towns in Europe, with its causes and effects, and the profound influence it had on the social conditions of the time.

From many of the statements in Mr. Adams's very interesting concluding chapter I should equally differ; and yet this chapter is one which is not merely interesting but soul-stirring, and it contains much with which most of us would heartily agree. Through the cold impartiality with which he strives to work merely as a recorder of facts, there break now and then flashes of pent-up wrath and vehement scorn for all that is mean and petty in a purely materialistic, purely capitalistic, civilization. With his scorn of what is ignoble and base in our development, his impatient contempt of the deification of the stock-market, the trading-counter, and the factory, all generous souls

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must agree. When we see prominent men deprecating the assertion of national honor because it "has a bad effect upon business," or because it "impairs the value of securities"; when we see men seriously accepting Mr. Edward Atkinson's pleasant theory that patriotism is of no consequence when compared with the price of cotton sheeting or the capacity to undersell our competitors in foreign markets, it is no wonder that a man who has in him the stuff of ancestors who helped to found our Government, and helped to bring it safely through the civil war, should think blackly of the future. But Mr. Adams should remember that there always have been men of this merely huckstering type, or of other types not much higher. It is not a nice thing that Mr. Eliot, the president of one of the greatest educational institutions of the land, should reflect discredit upon the educated men of the country by his attitude on the Venezuela affair, carrying his desertion of American principles so far as to find himself left in the lurch by the very English statesman whose cause he was championing; but Mr. Adams, by turning to the "History" of the administration of Madison, by his brother, Henry Adams, would find that Mr. Eliot had plenty of intellectual ancestors among the "blue lights" federalists of that day. Timothy Pickering showed the same eager desire to stand by another country to the hurt of his own country's honor, and Timothy Pickering was a United States Senator whose conduct was far more reprehensible than that of any private individual could be. We have advanced, not retrograded, since 1812.

This applies also to what Mr. Adams says of the fall of the soldier and the rise of the usurer. He quite overstates his case in asserting that in Europe the soldier has lost his importance since 1871, and that the administration of society since then has fallen into the hands of the economic man, thereby making a change "more radical than any that happened at Rome or even at Byzantium." In the first place, a period of a quarter of a century is altogether too short to admit of such a generalization. In the next place, the facts do not support this particular generalization. The Germans are quite as military in type as ever they were, and very much more so than they were at any period during the two centuries preceding Bismarck and Moltke. Nor is it true to say that "the ruler of the French people has passed for the first time from the martial to the moneyed type." Louis XV and Louis Philippe can hardly be held to belong to any recognized martial type; and the reason of the comparative sinking of the military man in France is due not in the least to the rise of his economic fellow-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countryman, but to the rise of the other military man in Germany. Mr. Adams says that since the capitulation of Paris the soldier has tended to sink more and more, until he merely receives his orders from financiers (which term when used by Mr. Adams includes all business and working-men) with his salary, without being allowed a voice, even in the questions which involve peace and war. Now this is precisely the position which the soldier has occupied for two centuries among English-speaking races; and it is during these very centuries that the English-speaking race has produced its greatest soldiers. Marlborough and Wellington, Nelson and Farragut, Grant and Lee, exactly fill Mr. Adams's definition of the position into which soldiers have "sunk"; and the United States has just elected as President, as it so frequently has done before, a man who owes his place in politics in large part to his having done gallant service as a soldier, and who is in no sense a representative of the moneyed type.

Again, Mr. Adams gloomily remarks that "producers have become the subjects of the possessors of hoarded wealth," and that among capitalists the money-lenders form an aristocracy, while debtors are helpless and the servants of the creditors. All this is really quite unworthy of Mr. Adams, or of anyone above the intellectual level of Mr. Bryan, Mr. Henry George, or Mr. Bellamy. Any man who has had the slightest practical knowledge of legislation, whether as Congressman or as State legislator, knows that nowadays laws are passed much more often with a view to benefiting the debtors than the creditors; always excepting that very large portion of the creditor class which includes the wage-earners. "Producers"—whoever they may be—are not the subjects of "hoarded wealth," or of anyone or anything else. Capital is not absolute; and it is idle to compare the position of the capitalist nowadays with his position when his workmen were slaves and the law-makers were his creatures. The money-lender, by whom I suppose Mr. Adams means the banker, is not an aristocrat as compared to other capitalists,—at any rate in the United States. The merchant, the manufacturer, the railroad man, stand just as the banker does; and bankers vary among themselves just as any other business men do. They do not form a "class" at all; anyone who wishes to can go into the business; men fail and succeed in it just as in other businesses. As for the debtors being powerless, if Mr. Adams knows of any gentlemen who have lent money in Kansas or similar States they will speedily enlighten him on this subject, and will give him an exact idea of the extent to which the debtor is the servant of the creditor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In those States the creditor—and especially the Eastern money-lender or "gold bug"—is the man who has lost all his money. Mr. Adams can readily find this out by the simple endeavor to persuade some "money-lender," or other "Wall Street shark" to go into the business of lending money on Far-Western farm property. The money-lender in the most civilized portions of the United States always loses if the debtor is loser, or if the debtor is dishonest. Of course there are "sharpers" among bankers, as there are among producers. Moreover, the private, as distinguished from the corporate, debtor borrows for comparatively short periods, so that he is practically not at all affected by an appreciating currency; the rise is much too small to count in the case of the individual, though it may count in the long-term bonds of a nation or corporation. The wage of the working-man rises, while interest, which is the wage of the capitalist, sinks.

Mr. Adams's study of the rise of the usurer in India and the ruin of the martial races is very interesting; but it has not the slightest bearing upon anything which is now happening in Western civilization. The debtor, in America at least, is amply able to take care of his own interests. Our experience shows conclusively that the creditors only prosper when the debtors prosper, and the danger lies less in the accumulation of debts, than in their repudiation. Among us the communities which repudiate their debts, which inveigh loudest against their creditors, and which offer the poorest field for the operations of the honest banker (whom they likewise always call "money-lender"), are precisely those which are least prosperous and least self-respecting. There are of course individuals here and there who are unable to cope with the money-lender, and even sections of the country where this is true; but this only means that a weak or thriftless man can be robbed by a sharp money-lender just as he can be robbed by the sharp producer from whom he buys or to whom he sells. There is in certain points a very evident incompatibility of interest between the farmer who wishes to sell his product at a high rate, and the working-man who wishes to buy that product at a low rate; but the success of the capitalist, and especially of the banker, is conditioned upon the prosperity of both working-man and farmer.

When Mr. Adams speaks of the change in the relations of women and men he touches on the vital weakness of our present civilization. If we are in truth tending toward a point where the race will cease to be able to perpetuate itself, our civilization is of course a failure. No quality in a race atones for the failure to produce an abundance of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

healthy children. The problem upon which Mr. Adams here touches is the most serious of all problems, for it lies at the root of, and indeed itself is, national life. But it is hard to accept seriously Mr. Adams's plea that "martial" men loved their wives more than "economic" men do, and showed their love by buying them. Of course the only reason why a woman was bought in early times was because she was looked upon like any other chattel; she was "loved" more than she is now only as a negro was "loved" more by the negro-trader in 1860 than at present. The worship of women during the Middle Ages was, in its practical effects, worship of a very queer kind. The economic man of the present day is beyond comparison gentler and more tender and more loving to women than the emotional man of the Middle Ages.

Mr. Adams closes with some really fine paragraphs, of which the general purport is, that the advent of the capitalist and the economic man, and especially the advent of the usurer, marks a condition of consolidation which means the beginning of utter decay, so that our society is now in a condition like that of the society of the later Roman Empire. He forgets, however, that there are plenty of modern states which have entirely escaped the general accelerated movement of our time. Spain on the one hand, and Russia on the other, though alike in nothing else, are alike in being entirely outside the current of modern capitalistic development. Spain never suffered from capitalists. She exterminated the economic man in the interest of the emotional and martial man. As a result she has sunk to a condition just above that of Morocco—another state, by the way, which still clings to the martial and emotional type, and is entirely free from the vices of capitalist development, and from the presence of the usurer, save as the usurer existed in the days of Isaac of York. Soldiers and artists have sunk lower in Spain than elsewhere, although they have had no competition from the economic man. Russia is in an entirely different position. Russia is eminently emotional, and her capitalists are of the most archaic type; but it is difficult to say exactly what Russia has done for art, or in what respect her soldiers are superior to other soldiers; and certainly the life of the lower classes in Russia is on the average far less happy than the life of the workingman and farmer in any English-speaking country.

Mr. Adams has shown well that the progress of civilization and centralization has depended largely upon the growing mastery of the attack over the defence; but when he says that the martial type necessarily decays as civilization progresses, he goes beyond what he can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prove. The economic man in England, Holland, and the United States has for several centuries proved a much better fighter than the martial emotionalist of the Spanish countries. It is Spain which is now decaying; not the nation with capitalists. The causes which make Russia formidable are connected with the extent of her territory and her population, for she has certainly failed so far to produce fighting men at all superior to the fighting men of the economic civilizations. In a pent-up territory she would rise less rapidly, and fall more rapidly, than they would; and her freedom from centralization and capitalization would not help her.

Moreover, instead of the mercenary or paid police growing in relative strength, as Mr. Adams says, it has everywhere shrunk during the last fifty years, when compared with the mass of armed farmers and wage-earners who make up a modern army. The capitalist can no longer, as in ages past, count upon the soldiers as being of his party; he can only count upon them when they are convinced that in fighting his battle they are fighting their own; although under modern industrial conditions this is generally the case. Again, Mr. Adams is in error in his facts, when he thinks that producers have prospered in the silver-using, as compared with the gold-using, countries. The wage-earner and small farmer of the United States, or even of Europe, stand waist high above their brothers in Mexico and the other communities that use only silver. The prosperity of the wage-earning class is more important to the state than the prosperity of any other class in the community, for it numbers within its ranks two-thirds of the people of the community. The fact that modern society rests upon the wage-earner, whereas ancient society rested upon the slave, is of such transcendent importance as to forbid any exact comparison between the two, save by way of contrast.

While there is in modern times a decrease in emotional religion, there is an immense increase in practical morality. There is a decrease of the martial type found among savages and the people of the Middle Ages, except as it still survives in the slums of great cities; but there remains a martial type infinitely more efficient than any that preceded it. There are great branches of industry which call forth in those that follow them more hardihood, manliness, and courage than any industry of ancient times. The immense masses of men connected with the railroads are continually called upon to exercise qualities of mind and body such as in antiquity no trade and no handicraft demanded. There are, it is true, influences at work to shake the vitality, courage,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and manliness of the race; but there are other influences which tell in exactly the opposite direction; and, whatever may come in the future, hitherto the last set of influences have been strongest. As yet, while men are more gentle and more honest than before, it cannot be said that they are less brave; and they are certainly more efficient as fighters. If our population decreases; if we lose the virile, manly qualities, and sink into a nation of mere hucksters, putting gain above national honor, and subordinating everything to mere ease of life; then we shall indeed reach a condition worse than that of the ancient civilizations in the years of their decay. But at present no comparison could be less apt than that of Byzantium, or Rome in its later years, with a great modern state where the thronging millions who make up the bulk of the population are wage-earners, who themselves decide their own destinies; a state which is able in time of need to put into the field armies, composed exclusively of its own citizens, more numerous than any which the world has ever before seen, and with a record of fighting in the immediate past with which there is nothing in the annals of antiquity to compare.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DR. EGGLESTON ON AMERICAN ORIGINS.

THE appearance of the first volume of Dr. Eggleston's long-promised "History of Life in the United States"[1] has been awaited with much impatience not only by students who are acquainted with his many years of patient research, but also by the general public, which knows him both as a novelist and as a lecturer and essayist on historical topics. It is now fourteen years since Dr. Eggleston began to write his interesting articles on colonial life, and it seems as though we have been made to wait an unaccountably long time for the first permanent fruits of his toil. But, as is generally known, feeble health has hampered him and true scholarship cannot or should not be hurried; hence neither Dr. Eggleston's friends nor the public have any right to complain. What we must all do is to admire the fortitude with which he has pursued his great task. He has accomplished long journeys by sea and land and made equally tiresome excursions through folios and manuscripts that would have been worse than a waterless desert to anyone but an indomitable scholar. Fortunately he has not been so sorely tried as our two great historians Prescott and Parkman were; but he has given evidence of the same spirit of determination that carried them through their gigantic undertakings, and if we may augur from their success, he will be spared to see the completion of his own noble enterprise. The future, however, is beyond us all, and so every reader will be glad that Dr. Eggleston resolved to put forth this first instalment of his work in order, to use his own words, that when early or late the inevitable night should fall the results of his labor might not be wholly covered over by the darkness.

But it is not the spirit of determination with which our author has prosecuted his work that chiefly concerns us here; it is rather the results of that work. What position must we assign Dr. Eggleston

[1] "The Beginners of a Nation." A History of the Source and Rise of the Earliest English Settlements in America with Special Reference to the Life and Character of the People. By EDWARD EGGLESTON. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1896.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among our historians, and what does his new volume stand for? Is he merely another, though a patient, gleaner in the well-threshed field of early American history, or has he simply retold in his always delightful style a story which we have heard so often that we are growing rather tired of it, or has he given us a fresh and vigorous rehandling of the familiar theme? For my own part I have no hesitation in answering that Dr. Eggleston is neither a plodding gleaner nor a merely pleasant narrator of what we all know, but a true historian, who has handled his materials in such a fresh and vigorous way as fairly to entitle him to the credit of having made a contribution of lasting value to our historical literature. This judgment will hardly be approved by any reader who is unable to rid himself of what may be called the annalistic conception of history. Such a reader will demand new facts or else old facts retailed in an orderly and exhaustive manner. Yet Dr. Eggleston could scarcely be expected to furnish any startling array of new facts that would compel a rewriting of our colonial history, and he certainly has not retailed the old facts in the orthodox way. Minute details that fill page after page of the learned compilations of his predecessors are passed over in silence or barely referred to; indeed, as an annalist Dr. Eggleston would hardly have earned his salt in a mediæval monastery. He will not earn praise from the dry-as-dust annalists and readers of annals of the present day. But he will earn the praise and gratitude of all who are interested in the development of the art of historical composition, of all who wish to see a fresh spirit and fresh methods applied to the writing of American history. He has not only made an excellent contribution to culture-history, but he has reached a vantage-ground of broad and free observation which few of his predecessors have so much as discerned, and which subsequent historians must strive to attain if they have any consideration of their fame.

Dr. Eggleston has himself described the main service he has done American history in these words of his preface which some readers may possibly strain into an apology: "The founders of the little settlements that had the unexpected fortune to expand into an empire I have not been able to treat otherwise than unreverently." Not *irreverently*—he is too true a man for that—but with absolute candor, firmness, and clearsightedness. In other words Dr. Eggleston has shaken off and cast to the winds the cloak of provincial grandiloquence and sensitiveness that has been handed on from historian to historian of our much bepraised and defended country. He sees plainly, for ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ample, that our early settlers were "simply English men and women of the seventeenth century, with the faults and fanaticisms as well as the virtues of their age." Accordingly he disregards the conventional obligation to show that their intolerance and cruelty were justifiable, believing that while "this walking backwards to throw a mantle over the nakedness of ancestors may be admirable as an example of diluvian piety" it is assuredly reprehensible in the writing of history. Acting on this belief and in the spirit of kindly humor which is conspicuous in the citation just made, he has subjected our primitive annals to a rigorous analysis and has given us a sane and unbiassed account of the planting of the first English colonies. He is perfectly capable of speaking disrespectfully not merely of the equator but of the Puritan and Cavalier alike—which is but to say that he possesses what so few of our historical writers are gifted with,—a sense of humor. He has a sense of proportion as well, and so is saved from devoting tedious pages to small Indian wars and from writing a ponderous brief for or against Captain John Smith's veracity in the Pocahontas incident. Whether or not he will suffer that "penalty of humor" which Prof. Brander Matthews assures us the American people always exact from their public men who try to amuse them, or whether his omission of trivial details will be imputed to him for historical unrighteousness is beyond my ken; but he has the thanks and admiration of at least one reader.

Dr. Eggleston has, then, utterly eliminated the provincial notes and grandiloquence and sensitiveness from his pages and has so set an example for all future historians to follow. There is another provincial note common to most of our writers of history which the nature of the period he treats has necessarily banished from his book, but which he is not likely to strike in his succeeding volumes—to wit, the note of isolation. A majority of our historians write as if we formed a world to ourselves and were not in reality an extension of Europe into another continent. Hence a note of provincial isolation attaches to their works, which may be interesting enough to us but are as jejune to the foreigner as the average county history is to anyone but a native. American history from the point of view of local politics is valuable in its way to citizens of this country, but American history from the point of view of the development of democracy and of the death of feudalism through the extinction of slavery is far more vitally interesting and important to the rest of mankind. That our historians all see the necessity for taking this larger point of view is probably

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

true, but the fact remains that they continually lose sight of it and so impart to their works the note of isolation. Histories divided into chapters and sections according to Presidential Administrations or to sessions of Congress may be edifying to the American mind, but the authors of such works need scarcely hope to be ranked among the world's great historians.

It is a singular fact that two foreigners, to one of whom, Mr. Bryce, Dr. Eggleston dedicates his book, have managed to get a broader grasp of our political development than any American has yet done; and that of all the historians of our national career in its widest sense Mr. Henry Adams only has succeeded in thoroughly treating his chosen period from the cosmopolitan rather than from the provincial point of view. The reasons for this state of affairs are not far to seek. Until quite lately our whole civilization was quite provincial and our historians were no better in this respect than the rest of their countrymen, except when they escaped into foreign or semi-foreign fields, as Motley and Prescott, and more recently Parkman did, and they were partisan in addition owing to the sectional complications arising out of slavery. The nation at large has since partly emerged from provincialism, but our historians have had the misfortune to subject themselves to the domination of a foreign school of investigators whose methods crudely imitated have led naturally to an accentuation of the note of isolation. German methods of research applied by scholars of wide and humane culture may lead to results that are anything but provincial in character, but German methods applied indiscriminatingly by half-educated specialists will give us nothing but the most isolated and provincial history possible.

The place of the United States in the development of Western civilization is necessarily outside the vision of the investigator who is practically ignorant of the history of every other nation save perhaps that of England. One might expect provincial ideas to prevail in the work of the historical societies—although not to the usual crass extent—for such work is by its nature local in character. But one is justified in looking for broader historical work on the part of our great universities, which nevertheless seem to be doing their very best to turn out students furnished with the narrowest sort of equipment. Narrow men do narrow work, and hence it is that the monograph and the thesis flourish while the art of true historical narration either stands still or languishes. It is a significant fact that one of the few really popular and admirable historians of the present time in America, Mr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Fiske, got his training as a philosopher; while Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Rhodes owe nothing of their deserved success to attendance upon Germanized seminars but owe much to the training received in commercial and official life. Now Dr. Eggleston comes along to swell the ranks of our self-trained historians, and while, as has been intimated, the dependence of the colonies upon the Old World necessarily prevents his first volume from being characterized by provincial narrowness, it is safe to affirm that he will show throughout his undertaking that freedom of treatment which our more technically trained specialists seem to take particular pains to avoid.

Freedom from grandiloquence, sensitiveness, and narrowness may then be said to be the distinguishing marks of Dr. Eggleston's method of presenting the results of his labors in the field of colonial history. Yet it must after all be admitted that his work is only supplementary to that of others and that there is still room for new investigators. Dr. Eggleston really aims at being a historian of culture and so does not give us a historical narrative in the orthodox sense of inclusiveness. In other words his book is rather a commentary on early colonial history than a history of the colonies strictly speaking. He assumes a considerable amount of information on the part of his readers and indulges to a great extent in allusions, which are often apt and graceful. Not merely, for example, does he forbear to give wearisome details about the Pequot war, which is a virtuous reticence, but he refers to it only twice—once in order to throw light on the character of Roger Williams and again in order to emphasize the addiction of the Puritans to superstition. So also he introduces distinguished personages in the most off-hand manner and dismisses them as abruptly. Even Captain Miles Standish himself makes his entrance and exit in two sentences which describe how he marched to church. More important topics, such as the origin of the Virginia Company, are hardly touched upon, while certain phases of the development of Puritanism in England are discussed at considerable length. I am not sure that in these matters Dr. Eggleston's sense of proportion is always seen at its best, but the main point to be noted is that his method of treatment is consistently that of a commentator rather than that of an orderly narrator. This is furthermore plain from the fact that when it suits his purpose our author can give us an almost entire chapter of biography pure and simple, such as that on Roger Williams, which is as interesting as one could well desire. Even in the external matter of style we find the method of the commentator asserting itself, for each chapter is divided into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

numerous sections, some of them only a paragraph in length, the continuous flow of the historical narrative proper being thus conspicuously absent with a resulting loss of charm. But a commentary, it is clear, can never take the place of an ordered narrative, and so there is still room for colonial historians of the ancient and time-honored type; though it cannot be too often asserted that they will do well to profit by the example of broad, free, and sane treatment that Dr. Eggleston has set them. If they cannot let a lambent humor play over their pages, they can at least avoid being at one and the same time both untrue to the facts of nature and experience and fatuously dull.

But it will be well to take a nearer view of Dr. Eggleston's volume now that we have ascertained its general character. Our historian is as sparing of dates as of unnecessary details, but we see at a glance that the three books into which his work is divided give us an account of the planting and critical years of Virginia, of the settlement of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay, and of the subsequent founding of Maryland, Rhode Island, and Connecticut—that is to say the narrative covers the first half of the seventeenth century. Virginia naturally occupies the first book, and very interesting reading the three chapters make. The unreverent note is struck at the beginning in the humorous account given of the mistaken notions about America cherished by our English ancestors. Perhaps Dr. Eggleston raises too many gentle smiles over these worthy visionaries, but it is certainly refreshing to get rid of the apotheosizing methods of the normal historian. It is just as well to have Hakluyt described in such a manner as to let any reader see that in our day he would be called a "crank" about geography, and it is equally well to have the thoroughly uncritical character of the age laid bare from every point of view. The truly heroic elements in the romantic story of exploration and discovery will emerge unscathed from any process of analysis, while the glamour that leads both the historian and the sentimentalist astray can be easily dispensed with.

Glamour certainly does not hover over the pages in which Dr. Eggleston describes the planting of Jamestown, but the essential fairness of his treatment is clearly demonstrated by his handling of that crux of early Virginian history—the character and career of Captain John Smith. He gives the fairest and most luminous account of Captain Smith's really great services to the infant colony and of his high qualities as a man of action and of practical intellect that I have read anywhere, but he does not feel called upon to place implicit confidence in the boastful traveller's every statement or to vouch for the literal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trustworthiness of each detail of the Pocahontas story. He does not even think the latter topic worthy of extended treatment, and this in spite of the fact that some years ago he was unwary enough to publish a plea on Smith's behalf. Such impartiality of spirit is rare among historians and is an additional warrant of the value that may be expected to attach to Dr. Eggleston's future volumes.

This balance of temper characterizes our author throughout his rather brief chapter on the motives that led to the planting of Virginia, especially in the section relating to the Ferrars—those queer high-church promoters of a commonwealth which has ever since been noted for its low-church proclivities. It is almost needless to say that the same breadth of treatment is seen in the second book, which is devoted to Pilgrim and Puritan. Dr. Eggleston is no more capable of adding another circlet of light to the halo fast thickening around the heads of New England's worthy settlers than he is of thinking the founders of Virginia inspired sages or Captain John Smith a seventeenth-century Thucydides. He does, however, feel himself called upon to give quite an extended description, considering the scope of his volume, of the rise of Puritanism and of the evolution of Separatism. One might possibly question the necessity for the inclusion of some of these pages and sections, but one cannot possibly question their interest. Nor can one question the clearness with which Dr. Eggleston has distinguished the stages of the religious evolution he is depicting. When he comes to the actual Pilgrim migration he still gives himself considerable latitude until he gets the Fathers fairly landed at Plymouth, when he rather unceremoniously takes leave of them and posts off to Boston, thus consciously or unconsciously imitating that inexorable "tide in the affairs of men" and towns, whose workings are so plainly seen in every age and in every land. The Pilgrims of Plymouth after they have led the way to a religious haven in the New World are obviously of less importance to a culture-historian than the Puritan founders of Massachusetts Bay, hence one can hardly quarrel with Dr. Eggleston for deserting them or for not giving more attention to interesting figures like Bradford and Standish. When he handles such a character as Endicott without gloves, as he does in the chapter entitled "The Great Puritan Exodus," one feels one's self to be in the hands of a discriminating historian who has a reason for his omissions and inclusions, and one who has the same feeling in regard to the treatment of the volatile Morton and his ribald company of Merrymount. In short this whole book, from its descrip-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the English exiles at Frankfort to its account of the removal of the charter from London to America is an excellent piece of historical writing, clear and bold in its outlines and carefully filled in at essential points. It reads easily, but that it was not composed easily is proved by page after page of scholarly notes, which are not allowed, however, to impede the progress of the narrative, but are gathered by themselves after each chapter as "Elucidations." The general reader will probably be content with the broad sunlight of the chapters and will leave the twinkling starlight of the notes to the professed specialist; but as the gloom of learning has a mysterious fascination about it even the airiest peruser will gaze with respect upon such fine-print evidences of exhaustive research.

The third and last book deals with the "Centrifugal Forces in Colony Planting," that is, with the founding of Maryland, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. Its title is impersonal enough to satisfy a disciple of Buckle, but the dominant method of treatment employed throughout its three chapters is personal enough to satisfy a disciple of Carlyle. In other words, Dr. Eggleston's sketches of George Calvert, Roger Williams, John Cotton, and Thomas Hooker are the most striking feature of this, not the least interesting, portion of his volume. It may seem odd to make such a statement about the work of a historian of culture but I at least am compelled to make it, and I must confess that for my own part I care very little whether Dr. Eggleston has or has not adhered to the canons of his art. We naturally associate fine historical portraits with writers like Clarendon or Macaulay or Carlyle, but I am very glad to get them from anybody, and I am sure that few historians have ever sketched a character better than Dr. Eggleston has done that of Cotton. Roger Williams is, indeed, a more engaging figure than the unctuous Boston preacher, who was as near to being a prelate as a Puritan divine could be, but even Williams does not stand out more clearly than Cotton, who when living was not particularly fond of standing out clearly for anything. The formal but really virile Hooker, too, emerges plainly, although the migration that he led to Connecticut is treated with a brevity that may make the institutional historian shrug his shoulders.

It is really quite curious to see how Dr. Eggleston's training as a novelist has made him give a personal and dramatic interest to chapters which the average historian would make sufficiently orthodox and heavy. When we look for careful and methodical descriptions of odd Puritan customs and observances, we find ourselves in the midst of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a vivid description of Mrs. Hutchinson before her biassed judges or of Roger Williams fleeing from the wrath of man to the wrath of nature that he might found a State in which perfect religious toleration should for the first time take up its abode upon earth. It is true that Dr. Eggleston's method is still that of the commentator rather than that of the narrator, and that he is continually throwing light on the customs and on the characters of the men and women of the time; it is true also that he seems to have recognized the personal note of his work by his use of the word "Beginners" in his title; but I cannot help believing that throughout his task he has been continually giving his imagination play, living again with those old ancestors of ours much as he would live with the personages of a story, and that he has thus in a partly unconscious way given us a less formal contribution to culture-history strictly speaking than he at first intended. I may, indeed, be far astray in this judgment, for nothing is easier than to read into a book what its author never intended to put there and what other readers will not see there; but I am at least sure that I have been transported to the America of the seventeenth century and have mingled with its chief personages in a manner scarcely expected when I opened Dr. Eggleston's book. As I am not an annalist or an institutional historian, or indeed a specialist of any sort, but a simple student desirous of living with and understanding the men and women of the past just as I would live with and understand the characters of a great novel or poem, it is needless to say that Dr. Eggleston has agreeably disappointed me by his vivid and dramatic treatment of a theme that might have easily been rendered tedious in proportion to its instructiveness. It seems to me that he has not so much told me about the founders of America as set me down among them, although like a good Virgil he has remained by my side and given me explicit and agreeable information.

In conclusion, one cannot but speculate on how our historian will conduct his work through its succeeding stages. As the colonies increase in number and become more thickly settled and enter into complex relations among themselves and with their hereditary foes, the French; as English habits give way and a nascent Americanism of thought and action becomes dimly perceptible, the task that Dr. Eggleston has set himself will grow more and more complex and the choice of his methods of treatment more and more important. He will doubtless continue to play the commentator, but he will have to make greater calls upon the previous information of his readers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For about a century he will probably resemble a painter who passes on to larger and larger sheets of canvas; but with the period of the French wars his difficulties will begin to culminate. He will have to bring out clearly the changing political ideals of the people at large, to trace the effects of the struggle for liberty upon their character, to show how they were modified by their newly won independence, and how each successive stage of the westward movement of population affected the older communities and the general constitution of the nation. In other words, he will be expected to describe the birth of a nationality without having unlimited recourse to the time-worn materials of political and military and diplomatic annals from which other historians can draw at pleasure. The magnitude of such an undertaking is apparent, but I believe that Dr. Eggleston is as equal to it as any historian we have had. And I fancy that he will not forbear to be personal and dramatic in his treatment of complex epochs any more than he has been in his management of a simple one.

In place of Roger Williams founding a new State, he can give us Franklin developing one already planted, and if he can sketch Franklin satisfactorily he need not despair of describing the people of whom that great man was the representative and epitome. In place of Hooker leading a congregation into the wilderness he can give us Washington on his surveying trips or on the ill-fated march with Braddock. Indeed, if his task does become more complex, it will become at the same time more intrinsically interesting. The planting of Virginia with broken-down aristocrats at whom Captain Smith railed may be more romantic but is not more absorbing to the thoughtful mind than the spectacle of Jefferson putting the axe to the tree of Virginian feudalism and at the same time sowing the seed of theoretical democracy. The explorations of the deluded navigators of the seventeenth century who sought the Pacific by voyaging up the Chickahominy river are not nearly so worthy of a historian's pen as the silent progress of the Western pioneer subduing the wilderness with his rifle and his axe.

In short, if Dr. Eggleston but keeps to the methods of treatment that lend such interest to his present volume, he is almost bound to make his readers more and more indebted to him as each successive instalment of his work is given to the world. That he may be spared to receive their thanks for his final volume will certainly be the wish of all readers of his first, who must now in any event subscribe themselves his debtors.

W. P. Trent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE URGENT NEED OF A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.

THE most important event in the history of modern Germany has been the foundation of the University of Berlin. The unification of the German empire was a matter of tremendous significance; the success of the German armies has widened the sphere of Teutonic influence; the recently adopted uniform code of laws marks the progress of national development; but more important as an epoch-making event has been the building of a great centre of human wisdom in Germany's chief capital. The influence of the University of Berlin not only shows itself in Germany's preëminence in scientific investigation and the wide diffusion of liberal culture, but is felt in every branch of industrial effort. There is no trade or handiwork in Germany that has not been made more effective by the practical application of investigations made in the great University. There is no line of effort in which men have not become wiser through the influence of the noble minds brought together to form this institution.

Nor is the influence of this university and its noble sister institutions confined solely or even mainly within the boundaries of Germany. The great revival of learning in the United States, which has shown itself in the growth of universities, in the rise of the spirit of investigation, and in the realization of the value of truth, can be traced in large degree to Germanic influences. These influences have not come to us through German immigration, or the presence of German scholars among us, but through the experience of American scholars in Germany. If it be true, as Mr. James Bryce says, that "of all institutions in America," the universities "have the best promise for the future," we have Germany to thank for this. It is however no abstract Germany that we may thank, but a concrete fact. It is the existence in Germany of universities, strong, effective, and free; and most notable among these is the youngest of their number, the University of Berlin.

This century has seen some epoch-making events in the history of our Republic. The war of Union, the abolition of slavery,—one and the same in essence—mark the same movement of the Republic from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mediævalism to civilization. But the great deed of the century still remains undone. Ever since the time of Washington, our law-givers have contemplated building a university at the nation's capital. They have planned a university that shall be national and American, as the Universities of Berlin and Leipzig are national and German; a university that shall be the culmination of our public-school system, and that by its vivifying influence shall quicken the pulse of every part of that system. For more than a century, wise men have kept this project in mind. For more than a century, wise men have seen the pressing need of its accomplishment. For more than a century, however, the exigencies of politics or the indifference of political managers have caused postponement of its final consideration.

Meanwhile, about the national capital, by the very necessities of the case, the basal material of a great university has been already gathered. The National Museum and the Army Medical Museum far exceed all other similar collections in America in the amount and value of the material gathered for investigation. The Library of Congress is our greatest public library; and, in the nature of things, it will always remain so. The Geological Survey, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the biological divisions of the Department of Agriculture are constantly engaged in investigations of the highest order, conducted by men of university training, and possible to no other men. The United States Fish Commission is the source of a vast part of our knowledge of the sea and of sea life. Besides these there are many other bureaus and divisions in which scientific inquiry constitutes the daily routine. The work of these departments should be made useful, not only in its conclusions, but in its methods. A university consists of investigators teaching. All that the national capital needs to make a great university of it, is that a body of real scholars should be maintained to train other men in the work now so worthily carried on. To do this would be to bring to America, in large degree, all that American scholars now seek in the University of Berlin. Students will come wherever opportunities for investigation are given. No standards of work can be made too high; for the severest standards attract rather than repel men who are worth educating.

It should not be necessary to bring arguments to show the need of a National University in the United States. A university, we may remember, is not a school for boys and girls, where the elements of a liberal education are taught to those who have yet to enter upon the serious work of life. A university is not a school maintained for the glory or the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extension of any denominational body. In its very definition a university must be above and beyond all sectarianism. Truth is as broad as the universe; and no one can search for it between any artificial boundaries. As well ask for Presbyterian sunshine or a Baptist June as to speak of a denominational university.

It is said that in America we have already some four hundred colleges and universities, and that, therefore, we do not need any more. Quite true; we need no more like these. The splendid achievement and noble promise of our universities, to which Mr. Bryce calls attention, is not due to their number. Many of them do not show this promise. If such were to close their doors to-morrow, education would be the gainer by it. Many of the four hundred, as we well know, are not universities in fact or in spirit. Most of the work done in the best of them is that of the German gymnasium or preparatory school. The worst of them would in Germany be closed by the police. But in a certain number of the strongest and freest the genuine university spirit is found in the highest degree. For more of these good ones there is a crying demand. Their very promise is a reason why we should do everything possible to make them better. A school can rise to be a university only when its teachers are university men; when they are men trained to face directly and effectively the problems of nature and of life. To give such training is the work of the university. In an educational system each grade looks to the one next higher for help and inspiration. The place at the head of our system is now held by the universities of a foreign land.

It is not the needs of the District of Columbia which are to be met by a University of the United States. The local needs are well supplied already. It is the need of the nation. And not of the nation alone, but of the world. A great university in America would be a school for the study of civic freedom. A great university at the capital of the Republic would attract the free-minded of all the earth. It would draw men of all lands to the study of democracy. It would tend to make the workings of democracy worthy of respectful study. The New World has its lessons as well as the Old; and its material for teaching these lessons should be made equally adequate. Mould and ruin are not necessary to a university; nor are traditions and precedents essential to its effectiveness. The greatest of Europe's universities is one of her very youngest. Much of the greatness of the University of Berlin is due to her escape from the dead hands of the past. It is in this release that the great promise of the American University lies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Oxford and Cambridge are still choked by the dust of their own traditions. Because this is so men have doubted whether England has to-day any universities at all.

The National University should not be an institution of general education, with its rules and regulations, college classes, good-fellowship, and football team. It should be the place for the training of investigators and of men of action. It should admit no student who is under age or who has not a definite purpose to accomplish. It has no time or strength to spend in laying the foundations for education. Its function lies not in the conduct of examinations, or the granting of academic degrees. It is not essential that it should give professional training of any kind, though that would be desirable. It should have the same relation to Harvard and Columbia and Johns Hopkins that Berlin University now holds. It should fill, with noble adequacy, the place which the graduate departments of our real universities partially occupy. In doing so it would furnish a stimulus which would strengthen all similar work throughout the land.

Graduate work has yet to be taken seriously by American universities. Their teachers have carried on original research, if at all, in hours stolen from their daily tasks of plodding and prodding. The graduate student has been allowed to shift for himself; and he has been encouraged to select a university not for the training it offers, but because of some bonus in the form of scholarships. The "free lunch" inducement to investigation will never build up a university. Fellowships can never take the place of men or books or apparatus in developing the university spirit. Great libraries and adequate facilities for work are costly; and no American institution has yet gathered together such essentials for university work as already exist at Washington.

If a National University is a national need, it is the duty of the people to meet and satisfy it. No other power can do it. As well ask wealthy manufacturers or wealthy churches to endow and support our supreme court of law as to endow and support our supreme university. They cannot do it; they will not do it; and, as free men, we would not have them do it if they would. As to this, Mr. John W. Hoyt—a man who for years has nobly led in the effort to establish a National University—uses these strong words:

"What should the nation undertake to accomplish? What the citizen has not done and cannot do, is our answer. The citizen may create a very worthy and quite important private institution, some of which may be named to-day, but no citizen, however great his fortune, and no single Commonwealth, much less any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sectarian organziation or any combination of these, can create an institution that shall be so wholly free from bias of any and every sort; that shall complete our public educational system; that shall exert so nationalizing and harmonizing an influence upon all portions of our great country; that shall be always ready to meet the demands of the Government for service in whatsoever field, and that shall at the same time secure to the United States an acknowledged ascendancy in the ever-widening field of intellectual activity."

A university bears the stamp of its origin. Whatever its origin, the university ennobles it. But a National University must spring from the people. It must be paid for by them; and it must have its final justification in the upbuilding of the nation. Whatever institutions the people need, the people must create and control. That this can be done wisely is no matter of theory. With all their mistakes and crudities, the State universities of this country constitute the most hopeful feature in our whole educational system. Doubtless the weakness and folly of the people have affected them injuriously from time to time. This is not the point. We must think of the effect they have had in curing the people of weakness and folly. "The history of Iowa," says Dr. Angell, "is the history of her State university." The same thing is grandly and emphatically true of Dr. Angell's own State of Michigan. In its degree the history of every State is moulded by its highest institution of learning.

As I have had occasion to say once before,

"Many trials are made in popular government; many blunders are committed before any given piece of work falls into the hands of competent men. But mistakes are a source of education. Sooner or later the right man will be found and the right management of a public institution will justify itself. What is well done can never be wholly undone. In the long run, few institutions are less subject to partisan influence than a State university. When the foul grip of the spoilsman is once unloosed, it can never be restored. In the evil days which befell the politics of Virginia, when the fair name of the State was traded upon by spoilsmen of every party, of every degree, the one thing in the State never touched by them was the honor of the university of Virginia. And amid all the scandal and disorder which followed our civil war, what finger of evil has been laid on the Smithsonian Institution or the Military Academy at West Point? On that which is intended for no venal end, the people will tolerate no venal domination. In due time the management of every public institution will be abreast of the highest popular opinion. Sooner or later the wise man leads; for his ability to lead is at once the test and proof of his wisdom."

Some of the half-hearted friends of the National University have been fearful lest partisan influence should control it. They fear lest it should become a prey to the evils which have disgraced our Civil Service; lest the shadow of the boss should darken the doors of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

University with the paralyzing influence which it has exerted on the employees of the Custom House. I believe this to be a groundless fear. All plans for a National University provide for a non-partisan board of control. Its *ex-officio* members are to be chosen from the ablest jurists and wisest men of science the country can claim. Such a board now controls the National Museum and the Smithsonian Institution; and no accusation of partisanship or favoritism has ever been brought against it.

A university could not be otherwise than free. Its faculty could respond only to the noblest influences. No man could receive an appointment of national prominence, in the face of glaring unfitness; and each man chosen to a position in a national faculty would feel the honor of his profession at stake in repelling all degrading influences. Even if occasionally an unwise appointment should be made, the action would correct itself. To a university, men and women go for individual help and training. A pretender in a university could not give such help. His presence is soon detected by his fellows and by his students. The latter he could not harm, for he could not retain them. By the side of his fellows he could not maintain himself. No body of men is so insusceptible to coercion or contamination as a university faculty. A scholar is a free man. He has always been so. He will always remain so. The danger, that a body of men such as constitute the university faculty of Harvard or Yale or Columbia or Princeton or Chicago or Cornell would be contaminated by Washington politics, is sheer nonsense. Such an idea has no basis in experience. It is urged only for lack of better arguments. Such opposition to the National University as has yet appeared seems to rest on distrust of democracy itself or on concealed hatred of secular education. To one or the other of these influences can be traced nearly every assault yet made on any part of the system of popular education.

The fear that the University would be contaminated by political associations is therefore groundless. But what about the hope from such associations? An educated politician may become a statesman, and we may look for tremendous results for good from the presence of trained economists and historians and jurists at the National capital. It would in itself be an influence for good legislation and good administration greater than any that we know. As President Cleveland said at Princeton University on the occasion of its sesquicentennial celebration:

"The worth of educated men in purifying and steadying popular sentiment would be more useful if it were less spasmodic and occasional. . . . Our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people readily listen to those who exhibit a real fellowship and friendly and habitual interest in all that concerns the common welfare. Such a condition of intimacy would not only improve the general political atmosphere, but would vastly increase the influence of our universities in their efforts to prevent popular delusions or correct them before they reach an acute or dangerous stage."

The scholars and investigators now maintained at Washington exert an influence far beyond that of their official position. If the Harvard faculty and its graduate students met on the Capitol hill, if their influence were in the departmental work, and their presence in social life, Washington would become a changed city. To the force of high training and academic self-devotion is to be traced the immense influence exerted in Washington by Joseph Henry, Spencer F. Baird, and Brown Goode. Of such men as these are universities made. When such men are systematically selected from our body of university professors and brought to Washington and allowed to surround themselves with like men of the next generation, we shall indeed have a national capital. By this means we shall create the best guarantee of the perpetuity of our Republic; that it shall not, like the republics of old, "go down in unreason, anarchy, and blood." In the long run, the voters of a nation must be led by its wisest men. Their wisdom must become the wisdom of the many, else the nation will perish. A university is simply a contrivance for making wisdom effective by surrounding wise men with the conditions most favorable for rendering wisdom contagious. There is no instrument of political, social, or administrative reform to be compared with the influence of a National University.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERN ARCHÆOLOGY: RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN GREECE.—IV.

In prosecuting the investigation of this subject we have now reached a point at which some account of the labors of the American School of Classical Studies is desirable. These labors mark an era in American scholarship; and the firm and rapid steps with which the members of the School progressed from one success to another entitle them to high praise. The School was founded in Athens, under the auspices of the Archæological Institute of America, in October, 1882.

It is doubtful, however, if the results would have been as satisfactory, but for the fact that the Government and the people of Greece, conscious of the duties imposed upon them by the imperishable heritage of which they are the guardians, extended to the American scholars favors that are also an earnest of indelible gratitude for American sympathy and succor during the long struggle for independence. Prof. M. L. D'Ooge, Director of the School, declares in the Seventh Annual Report that

> "The school could not possibly have enjoyed the advantages with which it has been favored, without the cordial support constantly given by the Greek Government and its officials. This interest has been shown in so many ways that I cannot enumerate them all. Every possible facility has been afforded the members of the School for study and investigation in free access to the museums, in liberty to copy or reproduce any objects of special interest, in grants of permission to excavate, in free use of the libraries of the Senate and of the University, and in introductions to officials in the interior, which greatly facilitated travel and study."

It may be stated at the outset that both the intrinsic merit of the American explorations and the special interest which they naturally possess for the American reader call for a somewhat fuller narrative than was deemed necessary in the preceding articles; while the absence of maps and plans in these pages renders a more detailed description of sites and structures inevitable. The several reports of the explorers themselves, which are scattered in various publications and are too technical for the general reader, have naturally served as the basis of these articles; but much new matter has been included.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the Archæological Institute of America belongs the honor of having first entrusted to American scholars the exploration of a Greek site—that of Assos, in the Gulf of Adramyttium, on the south coast of the Troad. It was the first contribution of America to our knowledge of classic antiquity; and the report of Mr. Joseph Thacher Clarke, who conducted the excavations (1881–2), shows that the results obtained were of great interest. The unearthing of the theatre of Assos, more especially, was an achievement of considerable archæological importance. As, however, Asia Minor does not come within the scope of these articles, I need here but briefly state that Dr. J. R. S. Sterrett, of the University of Virginia, having joined the School at Athens in 1882, spent six weeks at Assos in deciphering the inscriptions there unearthed, and now exhibited, for the most part, in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. In the following summer he again visited Asia Minor with Prof. W. M. Ramsay, who had been sent out by the (British) Asia Minor Exploration Fund. The results of his researches are recorded in two dissertations on the "Inscriptions of Assos" and the "Inscriptions of Tralles," published in the first volume of the "Papers of the American School at Athens." The second volume of this valuable publication is occupied exclusively by the "Epigraphic Journey in Asia Minor" made by Dr. Sterrett, again in company with Prof. Ramsay, in the summer of 1884; and the third, by an account of the "Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor" (its expenses having been defrayed by the late Miss C. L. Wolfe, of New York) under Dr. W. H. Ward and Mr. Haynes, whom Dr. Sterrett accompanied in 1885. Of these two journeys, the former yielded three hundred and ninety-eight and the latter six hundred and fifty-one Greek inscriptions, almost all newly discovered and inedited. During these successive explorations Dr. Sterrett determined the sites of several ancient cities,—including that of Lystra, of the New Testament,—and gathered valuable material for the reconstruction of the map of districts in Asia Minor hitherto imperfectly known; while his labors in the field of Anatolian epigraphy —a branch of research requiring much patience and wide erudition —admittedly rank second only to those of Le Bas and Waddington. M. Waddington wrote:— "European scholars have hailed with delight the entrance of America into the old field of archæological research, and will welcome such additions to our knowledge of Asia Minor as are contained in the account of the Wolfe Expedition."

As the first American exploration in Greece proper, we may consider the survey of the Pnyx at Athens, made in 1883 by Mr. Clarke.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That glorious hill and the remains upon it had never before been exactly measured or figured with the aid of proper instruments. Mr. Clarke's plans accompany an able dissertation on the subject, contributed to the fourth volume of the "Papers" by Mr. J. M. Crow, one of the students of the School at Athens.

But the chief mission of the School—the study of archæology as a science—could be fulfilled only by the prosecution of original and systematic excavations. Work of this description was therefore undertaken in April, 1886, at Thorikos, on the southeast coast of Attica, within easy reach of Athens, and in the immediate proximity of the famous silver mines of Laurium. The name of Thorikos is still given to a village built on the very coast, near the harbor (now Porto Mandri) of the ancient town. It is early celebrated in fable as the home of Kephalos, the lover of Prokris. In the time of Cecrops, Thorikos was one of the twelve cities of Attica, prior to the great settlement of Theseus at Athens; but later its importance seems to have diminished. It is referred to by Homer ("Hymn. Cer." 126), by Herodotus (lv. 99), by Thucydides (viii. 95), five times in Demosthenes, and elsewhere. Xenophon ("Hellenica," i. 2) states that in the twenty-third year of the Peloponnesian War (409 B.C.) the Athenians fortified the place with a wall, intended to protect the neighboring silver mines. Strabo mentions Thorikos, but gives no details; while Pausanias appears not to have visited it. It must have fallen into ruins before the first century of our era, for Mela ("De Situ Orbis," ii. 3) speaks of Thorikos and Brauronia as "olim urbes, jam tantum nomina."

Coming to modern travellers, J. C. Le Roy gives, in his "Ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce" (1758), ii. 2, an account of what he considered to have been the remains of a hexastyle Doric temple in the vicinity of Thorikos. Col. Leake ("Topography of Athens and Duni," ii. 70) with characteristic sureness of perception, describes it as "a *stoa* in the *agora* (forum) of Thoricus," 105 feet long by 48 feet broad. Dodwell ("Classical Tour," i. 535) remarks that "as the whole of the ruin has fallen, and is nearly covered with thick bushes of lentiscus, it was not possible on my visit to develop its plan without making excavations." Such excavations were carried out even before the publication (1819) of the "Tour," by a mission of the Society of Dilettanti in 1812, and the results of those researches are included in "The Unedited Antiquities of Attica" (1817), pp. 57–59. The highly finished and accurate drawings of this publication show that portions of sixteen columns of the *stoa* were then standing in their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

original positions; but of these only a few remnants were found by the American explorers. Their attention was therefore centred on the other remains.

Dodwell speaks of the Acropolis of Thorikos, "on a pointed hill above the city," of the walls which surrounded it, the "curious and magnificent theatre," the seats of which were still preserved, and of a pointed gate of the Cyclopian or Tirynthian style in the wall of the theatre. But neither the description nor the engraving of the theatre in Dodwell is accurate. Leake ("Duni," ii. 69) gives another plan of "the singular form" of the theatre; but this also has been proved by the American excavators to be out of proportion. Wordsworth ("Athens and Attica," p. 210), after remarking that "a theatre was an appropriate edifice at Thoricus, for it was in the port of this place that Dionysus, the deity of the Athenian drama, first landed in Attica," goes on to explain, with greater accuracy than his predecessors, that

"the outline of this theatre is not of a semicircular form; it is of an irregular curve, nearly resembling the fourth of an ellipse,—the longer axis commencing with the stage, and the seats beginning from the lesser axis and running in tiers rising above each other concentrically with the curve. . . . In the wall near the theatre is an old postern, surmounted by a pointed arch formed by approaching horizontal courses, in the same manner as the arches in the galleries at Tiryns. We trace the walls of the Acropolis stretching for a considerable extent over two rugged hills, which rise to the northeast of the theatre. The style and massiveness of this postern afford clear evidence of the great antiquity and local importance of Thoricus."

Referring to this noteworthy gate, J. Fergusson states, in his "History of Architecture" (1876), i. 215, that "the gateway of Thoricus shows the simplest and earliest form" of this kind of Pelasgic structure.

Subsequent travellers — Fiedler, "Reise durch Griechenland" (1841), p. 41; Vischer, "Erinnerungen aus Griechenland" (1856), p. 67—also refer to the ancient remains at Thorikos; while Bursian, "Geographie von Griechenland" (1862), i. 353, gives another outline, drawn by himself on the spot, of the *cavea* (auditorium) of the theatre, and speaks of that structure as unique, on account of its odd shape—"barocke Forme." Finally, at a meeting of the Archæological Society of Berlin, in January, 1878,

"Herr Peltz spoke of the antiquities to be seen at Thoricus, submitting a sketch of the theatre, the diameter of which was 54 metres. He explained its remarkably irregular outline, and referred to the peculiar construction of the outside wall surrounding the tiers of seats—a construction which also occurs in a square tower on the plain, and which leads to the conclusion that these structures belong to a very high antiquity. The seats, of which only a few traces are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preserved, follow the natural slope of the hill. Nothing remains of the stage structure. In the neighborhood of the theatre are scanty remains of an apparently later marble building, consisting of one corner of the foundation and four roughly dressed drums without flutings, 82 centimetres in diameter."

It will thus be seen that there were indications in abundance to guide the American excavators in this their first venture. Moreover, the remains visible above ground left no doubt as to the exact position of most of the ancient structures at Thorikos. The venture, which promised to solve some important archæological questions, had the approval of Prof. W. Dörpfeld, the Director of the German School at Athens; and permission to excavate was readily granted by the Greek Government. The work was begun under Prof. Fr. D. Allen on April 13 and continued for a week. It was resumed on May 5 and carried on till June 2 under Mr. Walter Miller. It was again taken up in November and completed early in December under Mr. Wm. L. Cushing. The preliminary and supplementary reports of the latter two scholars, enriched with plans and illustrations, are inserted in the fourth volume of the "Papers." The general aspect of the locality, immediately before the excavation, is graphically described by Mr. Cushing:—

"As one approaches the theatre from Laurium, the spot is seen, at some distance up the valley on the left, where, in the early part of this century, the British Society of Dilettanti excavated a Doric *stoa*. Here, half buried in alluvium, are numerous unfinished drums. . . . Not far from the *stoa*, on two low foot-hills, rude remains of an ancient civilization are visible—roughly hewn stone blocks, and traces of a circular wall of upright slabs. Directly from the plain, at this point, rises on the northeast a conical hill, the west slope of which is covered with a confusion of walls, mostly of rude and weak construction. The southern slope is thickly strewn with chips of white marble, which partly hide numerous graves and a plain sarcophagus. In this desolate field, at the lower edge of the hillside, stand the well-built walls of a theatre and of the watch-tower."

It was to this last-mentioned point that the American explorers directed their efforts. We have already seen that the theatre of Thorikos, though poor in appearance, had attracted the attention of all scholarly travellers by reason of the peculiar formation of its *cavea*. They had all noticed that it was not in the shape of a horseshoe, or semicircle, usual in Greek theatres, but in what may be most accurately described as the form of a sickle. No one, however, could offer any satisfactory explanation. Wordsworth (*l. c.*, p. 210, n.) refers, with some hesitation, to two plates (55 and 56) in A. L. Millin's "Peintures de Vases Antiques" (Paris, 1810), which are reproduced, for a similar purpose, in the notes (vol. ii. 86) of the architect Wm. Kinnard to his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

edition (1825) of Stuart and Revett's "Antiquities of Athens." These two vase-paintings, which represent portions of the theatre of Bacchus at Athens in its early state, certainly present some similarity with the irregular lines of the Thorikos theatre; but they are rather the result of a faulty perspective on the part of the vase-painter than a true rendering of the aspect of the early Athenian *cavea*. No purpose could have been served by preferring an irregular form; and the only other supposition advanced was that the unsymmetrical curve at Thorikos was imposed by the natural configuration of the ground.

It was this problem that the American School was called upon to solve. The choice they made for their first venture in excavations was, therefore, in the interests of science, a happy one. The history of the Greek stage is not yet entirely elucidated and the recent discovery of the theatre at Epidauros rekindled the discussion as to the architectural economy of Greek theatres. It was thus a matter of great importance to ascertain the original arrangements in such structures as had not undergone modification during Roman times; and there was every reason to expect that the theatre of Thorikos answered to this desideratum. The "rude remnants of an ancient civilization" noticed by Mr. Cushing in its immediate vicinity, the undoubted Pelasgic gate already referred to, the style of the masonry of portions of the other structures,—all spoke of the great antiquity of the place.

But another characteristic feature of Greek architecture was at once observable. The unerring judgment and unrivalled taste of the Greeks in choosing the most appropriate and most attractive sites for their public buildings is exemplified even in this comparatively poor locality. The cone-like hill, some 146 metres high, which rises above the ancient town, forms two spurs, between which the theatre was imbedded; and the seats covering the slopes commanded the most exquisite view of the plain below, the island of Helena lying at the feet of the spectators, and Kythnos, Keos, and Seriphos dotting the blue sea beyond. In other respects, however, no efforts had been made at architectural display or decoration. The opportunities offered by the natural configuration of the hillsides were taken advantage of in the simplest manner; and in this lay the solution of the problem which had puzzled archæologists. The American excavators had hardly unearthed some of the rows of seats when it became manifest that the locality itself offered no insurmountable difficulty to the adoption, as the form of the *cavea*, of the segment of a circle normal in Greek theatres. It is true that the insufficient inclination of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ground necessitated the construction of a massive retaining wall for the farthest rows of seats; but there was no reason why the ends of this wall were not rounded, other than a desire to save the labor and material which would have been expended in correcting the natural irregularities of the hillside on which the seats were ranged. No effort had been made to form an accurate semicircle; only a rough kind of symmetry, answering to practical requirements, was aimed at; and therefore the curve of the *cavea* was not that of a semicircle, but of an irregular ellipsis.

This view was amply confirmed by the general character, workmanship, and architectural arrangements of the structure, which all spoke of the restrained needs and poor resources of the small and rural community whom it was destined to serve. The seats, which have no stone facings, are covered with more or less rough slabs hewn from the adjoining rock; a rude, low wall divides the *cavea* from the orchestra; and this consists of a simple floor of baked earth. Moreover, in marked contrast to the vast seating capacity of most Greek theatres, not more than five thousand spectators could be here accommodated. The theatres of Argos and Chæronea only are smaller. Originally the auditorium was even more circumscribed, as an old inner retaining wall testifies. Parallel to this, and at a distance of 18 metres farther out, another and a much more substantially constructed wall was raised at some later time,—when the increase of the population demanded it,—the intervening space being filled in, and new tiers of seats carried up at the same inclination as the old.

Another peculiarity of this theatre was found to be the entire absence of a stage. Beyond a straight wall, which rises sixteen feet from the lower slope of the hill and retains the levelled mass of earth forming the platform of the orchestra, in front of the sloping tiers of seats, there is absolutely no trace of any structure answering to the stage observable in other Greek theatres. This peculiarity seems to confirm Prof. Dörpfeld's theory that prior to the time of Lycurgus, the orator (*circ.* 340 B.C.), there existed no stage, but that the orchestra was a complete circle, on which theatrical representations, more in the nature of choruses and rough performances of buffoons, were held. The old tradition must have survived in rural and poor communities, where the conventional niceties of the Greek drama were not observed, but both choruses and actors performed on the floor of the orchestra. In the Thorikos structure, therefore, we have an example—the only one so far discovered—of a primitive theatre, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its transition from a still earlier state when the spectators assembled on the bare slope of a hillside to look down upon the performances and dances carried on on a levelled piece of ground in front of them.

On the eastern flank of the orchestra, a chamber fifty feet long, with sides ten feet high, was found cut in the native rock. It does not seem to have been in any way connected with the economy of the theatre; but the work, which reminds one of similar traces on the rocks at Athens, shows it to be a remnant of remote antiquity. At the western end of the orchestra, however, a small structure was unearthed intimately related to the origin of the Attic drama and to the early associations of Thorikos itself. It was found to be the ruin of a temple 8.70 by 6.30 metres, a portion of its stylobate being cut in the rock. The portions of the north and west walls of the cella, which still rise some feet above the ground, are the most carefully finished pieces of masonry at Thorikos, with good joints and well-squared corners. An architrave, fragments of the marble cornice, some of the roofing tiles, and the terra-cotta antefixæ show it to have been an Ionic temple *in antis*. Finally, a broken stele bearing the word ΔΙΟΝΥΣΩΙ—the only inscription recovered during the excavations—confirms the supposition that the temple was sacred to Dionysos; while the form of the letters bears out the conjectured date of the structure. This was arrived at by another process of reasoning: A bronze coin of Athens was found in a joint of the cella wall, where it must have been deposited during the building of the temple. Now, as bronze coins were issued at Athens for the first time under the Archon Kallias (406 B.C.), but were demonetized in 394, and as they were reissued in 350–322, it is conjectured that the temple dates from this latter epoch.

The outer wall of the theatre, as well as the massive square tower near it, is in a style of masonry transitional from the polygonal to the quadrilateral—a style which cannot be strictly confined to any one period. As, however, they are very similar in construction to the walls of Œniadæ in Akarnania,—known to have been fortified by Philip,—with the restorations of Orchomenos in Bœotia, made by Philip and Alexander, and with the structures of Epaminondas at Messene and Eleutheræ, the inference is that the enlargement of the theatre took place in the early Macedonian period; whereas the inner wall, marking the original dimensions, is assignable to the latter half of the fifth century, and portions of the structure to a still more remote time.

Only a few unimportant pieces of pottery, a lion's claw and a life-size thumb in Pentelic marble, were found in the course of these exca-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vations, which were unfortunately left incomplete. Portions of the orchestra and three or four of the lower tiers of seats were alone cleared of earth. Some tentative search was made in the immediate vicinity; but the site was not systematically explored nor was it nearly exhausted. We shall see farther on that a similar error was committed in other instances,—an error which, when not imposed by lack of funds or occasioned by inexperience, is on all counts regrettable. Such incomplete explorations are not fruitful, either in personal *kudos* or in scientific reliability. This was exemplified in the case of Dr. Schliemann, when subsequent and more thorough examinations of sites which he thought he had exhausted, entirely upset the cherished theories he had founded upon insufficient data.

Thorikos presented a similar example. As we have seen above, Mr. Cushing had noticed, "not far from the *stoa*, on two low foot-hills, rude remains of an ancient civilization—roughly hewn stone blocks and traces of a circular wall of upright slabs." Such indications were sufficient to fix the attention of experienced archæologists. Consequently the Ephoria, or Directorate, of the Greek Archæological Department decided to investigate the site thoroughly; and excavations were ordered in December, 1890, and continued in 1893–94 under Dr. Staes. On the eastern declivity of the conical hill now called Velatouri (possibly a Greek adaptation of the Italian "Bellatore"), on the south slope of which stands the theatre, two prehistoric tombs, situated 250 metres apart, were successively opened. The position of the one farthest down the hill was well known, it having been exposed apparently to repeated attempts at violation, from the Roman times onward. The earlier riflings of tombs are determinable by the fact that their object was, not antiquarian finds, but precious objects in gold and silver. And such prehistoric royal tombs were rich in these objects. To this fact may be traced the name of "Treasuries" under which these structures were traditionally known. Where terra-cotta figurines and vases are still left in them, the pillage is traceable to Roman or Byzantine times. Now these "bee-hive" tombs—so called from their inward conformation—were exposed to view, because they were generally covered by a mound of earth; and, though of massive construction, were easily assailable. The dome-like part of the roof, which usually projects from the ground, was broken in, and access to the interior was obtained by a ladder. By the subsequent accumulation of earth, the tomb filled up; and a fresh exploration became a matter so laborious as to deter the latter-day professional poachers of antiques.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The tomb just referred to was noticeable for its peculiar formation. It is not circular but elliptic in shape; and its apex is not a conical dome, but more like a pack-saddle. It is approached by the usual *dromos*, or entrance, abutting in a great gate 2½ metres high and 1½ metres broad, which is closed in by massive slabs. In this tomb, only fragments of Mykenæan pottery and a few leaves of gold were found. The other tomb, however, of the normal circular shape, situated farther up the slope, yielded a richer harvest. Having been entirely covered by the soil crumbling down the hill, it remained unknown until its walls were discovered in the course of these excavations. It is of majestic dimensions, 10 metres in diameter and 8 metres high, independently of the conical superstructure, which had fallen in. A dozen men had to be employed for a fortnight, before it was cleared of the earth and the huge stone blocks which encumbered it. It is approached by a *dromos* 12 metres in length, and a doorway 3½ metres high, through which a large carriage might easily be driven. Within the circular area are three graves cut in the rock of the floor, covered with large stone slabs; while on each side of the door two other graves are built up, one of them obliquely over one of the underlying slabs. Such superincumbent tombs were now for the first time met with in a "bee-hive" structure, and, though of the Mykenæan epoch, were apparently later modes of prehistoric burial.

All these graves, with one exception, had already been rifled. Entrance had been effected as usual through the ruined dome, the doorway having been found still blocked with the three original slabs *in situ*. The ransacking must have been somewhat hurried, or the booty enormous; for, besides the terra-cotta vessels, several objects of value had been left behind, including a gold finger-ring, two fibulæ (brooches),—one formed of two gold wings and the other of amber,—jasper beads, and a quantity of gold myrtle and laurel leaves. Also a beautifully worked comb, a needle, and a quiver in ivory; a bronze mirror; two stone arrows of very fine workmanship. Certain leaden disks found in these tombs and decorated with concentric rings in colors are believed to be money; while a marble vase, filled with fragments of early poetry and the bones of animals, is supposed to contain the remains of the funeral repast. The untouched grave in the rock was next opened; but strangely enough it contained no funereal offerings. A man's skeleton, however, was found in perfect condition, and is now exhibited in the Central Museum at Athens as an extremely rare instance of such preservation of human remains of that very early time.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some thirty metres higher up the hills, the foundations of an important building were unearthed, resting on the bed-rock and supposed to have been the palace dominating an entire city, which was gradually discovered in the immediate vicinity and which seems to have been buried by some convulsion of nature in prehistoric times. It appears to have been not Hellenic, but Mykenæan in character, judging from the fragments of pottery of the Hissarlik type. Such are briefly the results obtained by the excavations continued subsequent to the American exploration of Thorikos. They all go to confirm the great antiquity and importance of that site.

The activity of the American School, however, was not to remain long in abeyance. In the autumn of the same year, 1886, the Ephor-General of Antiquities offered to the School the privilege of excavating the theatre of Sicyon. The site was visited toward the end of February, 1887, by Prof. M. L. D'Ooge, accompanied by the Directors of the British and German Schools, Mr. Penrose and Dr. Dörpfeld, and work was begun on March 23, continuing, under Mr. W. J. McMurtry, up to May 10. It was resumed on December 5 and brought to a close in January, 1888, under the supervision of Mr. M. L. Earle; the late Prof. A. C. Merriam being at that time Director of the School. The reports of these excavations, drawn up by Messrs. McMurtry and Earle, are included in the fifth volume of the "Papers."

Sicyon, one of the earliest known cities in Greece, appears also under the name of Ægialeia (or Ægiali), indicative of its primacy on that coast; of Telchinia, pointing to its early proficiency in metal-work; and of Mecon, a name explained by the abundance and luxuriance with which the wild poppies, undisturbed by the mighty changes which have swept over the old site, continue to flourish to this day, clothing it each successive spring with a fresh robe of scarlet. Hesiod ("Theogony," 536) places here a contest between gods and men. But the name Sicyon, first mentioned in Homer ("Iliad," ii. 572), is connected with the Ionian origin of its inhabitants, who later succumbed to the Dorian conquerors of the Peloponnesus. Under successive families of Despots, the city attained to a high pitch of prosperity. It erected treasuries of its own at Olympia and Delphi, and its coins, distinguished by the device of a flying dove, were current throughout Greece. After participating in the political vicissitudes of the other Greek states, Sicyon had lost much of its former importance, when, in 303 B.C., Demetrios Polyorketes prevailed upon its inhabitants to abandon the scattered lower town, extending to the sea, and to gather on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ancient Acropolis, which included arable lands and was well supplied with water. On the destruction of its rival, Corinth, by the Romans in 146 B.C., Sicyon secured the administration of the Isthmian games. Its renascent prosperity, however, proved short-lived. The Romans denuded it of its most valuable works of art, including its famous paintings; and what they spared was destroyed, with the greater part of the city, by a violent earthquake in the reign of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138–160). When Pausanias visited Sicyon shortly afterward, he found it almost depopulated. In that condition it must have lingered on to the sixth century of our era, at which time it is referred to as New Sicyon; probably so named ever since the concentration of Demetrius, the port being apparently the old town. Indeed Pausanias speaks of the lower city as the original Ægialeia. In Suidas (tenth century) the Byzantine appellation of Sicyon is given as Hellas, evidently in contradistinction to the numerous Slavonic settlements which had peopled the surrounding country. An insignificant village now occupies the northern extremity of the once famous Acropolis; and its modern name, Vasilika, the Royal, speaks of its abiding Greek traditions and of the imposing aspect of the surrounding remains of theatre and temples.

In point of fact Sicyon was at all times famous more as a centre of art than of political activity. The surpassing beauty of its site, its poetic associations, the mixture of Ionic and Doric blood in its inhabitants,—all contributed to endow it with artistic taste and talent. Tradition, therefore, made of Sicyon the birthplace of the art of painting, of which it certainly long remained the home ("diu illa fuit patria picturæ." Pliny, "Natural History," xxxv. 11, 40). The Sicyonian school of painting, founded by Eupompos, produced Pamphilos and Apelles. Butades, a Sicyonian, is said to have been the first to make images in clay; and the art of the statuary, introduced toward the middle of the sixth century from Crete, culminated here in the masterpieces of Lysippos. The Sicyonians were also famous for their great taste in making articles of dress,—notably a special kind of shoe.

To this day one cannot visit the site without being inspired and captivated by its grandeur and beauty. Situated some two miles inland, the plateau, on which the Acropolis stood, looks down upon a succession of terraces planted with vineyards, and sloping toward the blue waters of the Gulf of Corinth. Beyond, to the north, on the opposite coast, rise the purple-colored Parnassus, the lofty Cithæron, and Helicon with all its noble associations. To the east Acrocorinthos

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rears its rugged head; while to the west stretches an undulating plain, proverbial for its richness. The plateau of Sicyon forms an irregular triangle, three miles in circumference at its eminence and of great natural strength. It is precipitous on all sides, and accessible from the plain only by two narrow passes. The hill is skirted at its foot by the Asopos on the east, and by the Helisson on the west; both rivers flowing toward the Gulf. The plateau itself is broken by a rocky ledge into an upper level, which stands in the rear, to the south, and forms about a fourth of the whole area: on this the new Acropolis of Demetrius was built. The lower level comprises fertile lands sufficient for the support of a considerable population. It was the site of the lower town; while a third section of the entire city was the maritime quarter on the coast. During the flourishing epoch the three settlements appear to have been connected by walls extending from the Acropolis to the sea. Of the upper city walls, built on the very edge of the hill, extensive remains may still be seen.

The description of Pausanias,—who refers to no less than fifteen temples, some of which were then already in ruins,—though in many respects detailed, does not assist much in determining the precise location of the various buildings he enumerates. An exception to this is the theatre, unmistakable remains of which were at all times visible. It is situated between the upper and lower level and is partly cut out of the ledge of rocks that separates the two. The auditorium, facing to the northeast, commands the magnificent view already described,—scenery which no modern scene-painter's brush can rival. Leake ("Travels in the Morea," iii. 357–70) computed the diameter of this theatre at 400 ft.; that of its orchestra at 100 ft.; and the length of the proscenium, the foundations of which he traced cut in the rock, at 75 ft. He thought there must have been forty rows of seats, in three divisions, separated by two *diazomata*. On the upper level of the plateau, the only remarkable feature, beyond the remains of certain foundations, is a very complete system of aqueducts, deeply cut in the rock and extending to the lower level. Here, however, may be traced, by the lines of stones still standing, the streets, which, in conformity with the rules of Vitruvius, run with precision from northeast to southwest, and from northwest to southeast. Not far from the theatre, to the northeast, brick walls, some 8 ft. high, mark the site of a Roman building, believed to have been a bath. To the west are the remains of the *stadion*, in the construction of which the declivity between the two levels was again turned to advantage. Some architectural frag-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments are imbedded in the walls of the village church, and in it is still preserved the fine Corinthian capital noticed by Blouet in 1828.

Such was the condition of the site immediately prior to the American exploration; and it is roughly so described by earlier visitors—Spon, Pococke, Foucherot and Fauvel, by Pongueville, who thought ("Voyage dans la Grèce," iv. 10) he had identified the temples of the Dioscuri and of Fortuna Acræa, and by Leake, who gives a good plan of the locality. It is also referred to by L. Ross ("Reisen in Pelopon," 39), Ernst Curtius ("Peloponesos," ii. 482–501), Beulé ("Études sur le Peloponise," 343) and Bursian (ii. 23–32). In common with their predecessors and immediate followers, the French savants of the *Expédition Scientifique de la Morée*, who visited Sicyon in 1828, did not attempt any excavations; but they measured and illustrated in three plates (81–83, vol. iii) the remains visible above ground. The site was therefore practically a virgin one when the Americans first undertook it.

Their object was to discover the complete plan of the theatre,—one of the largest in Greece,—so as to render possible the accurate study of its structure and disposition. The declivity on which the auditorium is almost entirely excavated had enveloped the ruin in a shroud of earth, increasing in depth from one metre in front, to three metres in the rear. The deposit on the orchestra was even heavier. Some of the earlier travellers consequently believed that almost all the rows of seats had disappeared. The theatre of Sicyon, however, like that at Epidauros, was found to be preserved comparatively unimpaired. The successive accumulations of earth had, fortunately, served as a protection provided by nature against the devastations of man. On the other hand, they rendered the work of the explorers less satisfactory, by restricting the first excavations to such parts of the structure as were indispensable to the elucidation of the plan of stage and orchestra. Of the rows of seats, the lower tiers alone were laid bare, and these only halfway round the orchestra. The two front rows were found to consist, as usual, of seats of honor, made of porous stone, many of them elaborate in execution, each having a back and arms. Five other rows are cut in the rock. Fourteen stairways, extending upward, divide the auditorium into thirteen *kerkides*, or wedge-shaped divisions. An elaborate drainage system forms a prominent feature of this theatre. The precise purpose of an imposing aqueduct, running under the orchestra and communicating with a line of earthen pipes under the stage, was not definitely settled until a third and a fourth exploration were undertaken, as we shall presently see. But the surface drainage was found to re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

semble closely the arrangement observable in the theatre at Athens. A deep stone trench runs round at the foot of the front row of seats, is bridged over by slabs opposite the stairways, and forms the boundary of the orchestra, which is here of an elliptical form. The floor is plastered over, as at Epidauros; as are the floor and walls of a chamber discovered in the rear of the stage, and supposed to have been a bath. Three main walls, forming the foundations of the stage, were unearthed; the one nearest the orchestra being 72 ft. in length and 3 ft. high. It is pierced by three doors, and stands on an ornamental border which extends the whole length. The marble blocks forming this border bear on the sides Greek letters, which manifestly served as masons' marks. The letters are of the ancient Attic alphabet; but the superstructure is Roman in character. As, however, some of the blocks composing it, as well as the side-walls, are of undoubted Hellenic workmanship, it is conjectured that the stage was remodelled at some later period, the date of the theatre itself being traceable to the fifth century.

An important discovery, in connection with the history of architecture, was that of two arched passages, still in excellent preservation, which served as entrance and exit to and from the higher rows of seats. They are built without a trace of mortar or brick, and correspond to the masonry of the Hellenic walls just mentioned. They are, therefore, indisputable Greek work; and, when considered together with a similar instance ascertained in the *Bouleutirion* (Senate House) of Olympia, they establish beyond doubt the fact that the arch was not a Roman invention, imported into Greece, but was originally used by the Greeks themselves, though only, as it would appear, in underground structures. Traces of a colonnade, adorning the front of the theatre, were also found. At this point the exploration of the theatre was discontinued for a time.

Beyond the theatre some search was made near the scattered remains of foundations, in the hope that inscriptions or other indications might determine the locality of some of the edifices mentioned by Pausanias. Nothing however was traced except a floor paved with black and white marble; a part, apparently, of an elaborate structure. Some ancient tombs, observed on the slope of the plateau and elsewhere, were uncovered; but it was soon evident that they had already been rifled. Among minor finds were three inscriptions of the classic, Roman, and Alexandrian times (published in the "Reports" of the excavations), some Sicyonian coins, and a few unimportant sculptured fragments. A beautiful female head was found in the possession of a peasant.

But the most valuable addition to ancient art was the discovery,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on December 10, of the head of a youth of very great beauty. It was at once sent to the Central Museum at Athens, as was also a male torso of white marble, unearthed, at a considerable distance in the orchestra, thirteen days later. When Mr. Earle returned to Athens, the Ephor, in his presence, placed on the torso the previously discovered head; and although a fragment on the left side of the throat was missing, the remaining portion of the two surfaces fitted so exactly, that the two sections formed beyond question one and the same statue. It represents a youthful male figure quite nude, except at the left arm, which is covered by a garment from the shoulder to the hip. Though not of the finest art, it is of excellent workmanship and of a good period; the pose of the head and the expression of the face being especially beautiful. It was at first believed to represent Dionysos; but, in his exhaustive account of the statue, Mr. Earle is inclined to consider it an Apollo. It may be merely an idealized portrait-statue. Though this point can never be decided with certainty, the statue is valuable as one of the few undoubted remains of the famous Sicyonian School.

For four years after the first two campaigns, the further exploration of the theatre of Sicyon was postponed. Both the material clearance of the structure remained incomplete, and the scientific elucidation of important points unattempted. But the excavation of the theatre at Eretria, which the American School had meanwhile taken in hand, raised a lively discussion in regard to an underground passage there discovered; and, as a similar feature had been observed at Sicyon, it was now determined to prosecute the enquiry at the latter place. It was the late Prof. Merriam who urged the duty of solving the problem of this subterranean structure; and Dr. Waldstein, the then Director of the School, having obtained fresh authority from the Greek Government, Mr. Earle, who had superintended the work during the first two seasons at Sicyon, conducted a third exploration, extending from July 27 to August 4, 1891.

We have seen above that what was at first believed to be a great aqueduct was noticed running from under the centre of the orchestra, in the middle line of the theatre, to under the stage-structure. It was clearly connected with the surface drainage, and without doubt it carried the rain-water beyond the stage through a line of earthen pipes; but it remained uncertain whether it served as reservoir, as drain, or for some other purpose. On proceeding now to clear out the two ends of the structure, Mr. Earle discovered that it abutted, under the centre of the orchestra, in a square tank-like opening, connected

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by side-gullies with the rain-water conduits. At the stage end five steps gave access from this passage to the interior of the stage; while beyond the stage-building it communicated, by a narrower tunnel cut in the rock, with one of the old waterways of the plateau. Mr. Earle's investigations, however, having been interfered with by ill-health, led to no conclusion; and the matter remained as much a mystery as ever.

The task of solving the problem was consequently entrusted to Messrs. Carleton L. Brownson and Clarence H. Young; and they continued the operations from December 23 to December 30, 1891. Mr. Brownson, who had gained valuable experience from the similar underground passage at Eretria, proceeded in a thorough and methodical manner to determine the meaning and purpose of the one at Sicyon. He uncovered it in its whole extent by removing the overlying slabs, and cleared it of the accumulated earth to the virgin soil. It thus became manifest that the *hyponomos*, as it was styled, was intended to carry off more rapidly the sudden and heavy rain-fall which poured down the auditorium into the circular conduit at the foot of the seats. The tank also received the surface drainage of the orchestra. But that was not its only purpose: the tank was mainly intended for stage effects on the orchestra, and was connected with the stage by the *hyponomos*, which served as a concealed passage-way for the actors. The greater dimensions and the more careful stone facing and flooring of the portion of the passage between the stage and the tank, as well as the steps which led from the interior of the passage into the stage-building, prove to demonstration that it was constructed with a view to such use. In treating of the excavations at Eretria we shall see that certain statements of Greek authors confirm this explanation.

But another interesting problem remained to be solved. Led by certain indications, Mr. Earle removed a portion of the later Roman wall on the stage-building and laid bare a row of porous stones in which a series of alternate large and small holes was worked at regular intervals. On visiting Sicyon, Dr. Dörpfeld had expressed the opinion that these holes served to secure the wooden *pinakes* or columns of the early Greek stage. Similar indications had been observed in the theatre of Megalopolis; and the researches of Messrs. Brownson and Young now fully confirmed that opinion.

After their first and second campaigns at Sicyon the members of the American School proceeded further afield in their Greek explorations. In my next article, I shall trace their footsteps onward.

J. GENNADIUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MELIORISM.

THERE has probably never been so much doubt of current beliefs and opinions as in the last quarter of the present century. The leading characteristic of the day is skepticism, much more of which is held than is expressed. Notwithstanding the interminable variety of creeds and convictions prevalent, one might infer, from reading and hearing, that there are, in the Western World particularly, but two forms of philosophy—Optimism and Pessimism. If a man takes a cheerful view of life, he is set down as an optimist; if a sombre one, as a pessimist. Optimism and Pessimism are extremes. Leibnitz, on the one hand, maintained the metaphysical doctrine, that the present universe is the best of all possible universes; Schopenhauer, on the other, maintained positively that this world is not only the worst that has ever existed, but the worst world that could exist. Probably, there are no genuine optimists or pessimists to-day,—those who believe that everything that happens is for the best, or for the worst. One position is as absurd as the other.

The ultra-orthodoxist assumes that the Divine Mind ordains and directs all things, from the highest to the lowest, on this insignificant planet,—he has no cosmic considerations,—and that, therefore, they are flawless, however viewed by mortal eye. This might be a very comfortable creed, if one could actually hold it; but nobody can—certainly not the orthodoxist himself. He is a frequent mourner over what has occurred: he would be only too happy to change what he claims to think the All-Wise and the All-Loving has decreed. He may make up for his inconsistency by accepting with entire resignation the misfortunes that have befallen his enemies. On the other hand, anyone who fancies himself a pessimist is well aware that, however wretched, he might be a hundred-fold more wretched. Human capacity for suffering being limitless, the term "pessimist" is a palpable misnomer. He might call himself a malist, a pejorist even, with some plausibility; but the use of the superlative degree is preposterous.

We very seldom hear of a meliorist,—Meliorism is, no doubt, a new word to many,—but meliorists may be found everywhere, and are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continually increasing. The philosophy, or religion, of Meliorism—the two words have, in their broad sense, substantially the same meaning—is sustained and cherished by the more intelligent, the thoughtful, in this country as well as in other enlightened lands. They may not avow it: it has no specific doctrines: it is without system or formalism of any sort. They feel it rather than advocate it. It is, in the main, purely rational, hopeful, intellectual, encouraging, entirely free from all superstition, incompatible with mere traditions or authority. The faithful and non-faithful, church communicants and secularists, may alike cleave to it, often without seeming to do so.

The philosophy of Meliorism is compounded of all philosophies from Plato's time to the present; it is an eclecticism of the best, because the most reasonable; of what has been demonstrated by experience, and justified by reflection,—a species of untechnical pantheism, in which humanity is paramount. Meliorism is, as its etymon intimates, the belief that the world is not only improvable, but steadily, though slowly, improving. If we could but measure and compute it, we should find the world is better this decade than the last; the present year than the previous one; to-day than yesterday. And this not more by the eternal law of Progress, than by the ceaseless aim and effort of Man to elevate and benefit his fellows. Meliorism is dynamic no less than ethical: it seeks to promote amendment of the social condition through intentional, deliberate calculation, and the selection of indirect agencies. Not satisfied simply to relieve suffering, it strives to introduce preventives of suffering. It is a regulating, practical principle; not in any way passive, as are the theories of Optimism and Pessimism.

In a religious sense, it openly acknowledges nothing but Law, and does not, as a rule, undertake to determine what may be behind the Law; only what is not behind it. It is perfectly willing that the power behind the Law shall be called God, Providence, the Supreme Being, the Great First Cause, or any other name. It never quarrels with nomenclature, and does not usually attempt exact, or indeed any kind of, definitions. But a meliorist may, for himself, reject, as illogical, as impossible, aught appertaining to a personal Deity. The controller of the world and the universe must be, he may hold, a principle, a spirit, a pervading influence. Many meliorists (each one may have his own belief) take this position, and contend for it stoutly; though many of them, again, forbear from putting their faith into words. Some of them are wholly naturalists; recognizing, with Feuerbach, that Nature and Man are alone apprehensible; that there is no God as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a distinct, creative being; that what is called so is the idealized essence of Man, or the deified essence of Nature. The word "God" Feuerbach considers vague, mysterious, undetermined, incomprehensible, in fact. Nature is the sole cause of existence in Man, and Nature becomes conscious of itself only in Man. Feuerbach is said to have transformed Hegelianism into Naturalism; which is virtually true. It is remarkable what a host of believers in Feuerbach's philosophy there are among the thoughtful, many of whom are scarcely acquainted with his name.

There are meliorists and meliorists. While many of them rarely speak of their opinions or beliefs, and seem to shrink from discussion, others enjoy it, though they seldom begin it. These are earnest, impassioned, but invariably tolerant and good-natured withal. They relish argument for argument's sake: they can take as well as give. They are exceptions to the ordinary rule, that debaters on theology lose their tempers: they cite themselves in proof. They assert that orthodoxists get angry when their declarations are disputed, but that rationalists seldom do so. They will listen amiably, with serene smiles, to the arraignment of infidels and scoffers, which they know refers to them. They hold that their amiability, instead of conciliating opponents, increases their wrath. Why, they ask, should a man, claiming to be absolutely certain of his premises, grow enraged when his conclusion is mildly questioned? The non-disputatious, more reticent meliorist thinks that his controversial brothers do no good by their arguments; that they might better confine themselves to practical benevolence, which they are ever ready and eager to carry out, disregarding adverse opinions—at best or worst, opinions merely. The controversial meliorists, on the other hand, maintain that opinions govern the world; that, inasmuch as orthodoxists are constantly trying to make converts, through the pulpit, the sectarian press, and personal influence, they (who honestly and conscientiously differ from them) have an equal right to present their side of the thesis. Why, they inquire, should theology and theological views be socially received with so much lenience by rationalists, who consider those views absurd and are persuaded that they can prove them to be so? It is, they say, making altogether too much concession to orthodoxy. The amiable, conventional folk who favor such concession, however diverse their own convictions, rarely, if ever, incline to extend the same generous indulgence to members of the agnostic class.

The aggressive meliorists, as they may be called, are particularly inimical to superstition, by which they mean whatever is not sanc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tioned by reason. They contend that orthodoxy, as taught and understood generally, is sheer superstition; that it is but a formulated kind of fetishism, and should be exposed as pernicious, when opportunities offer. Whatever is untrue, and can be shown to be untrue, is injurious, mentally and morally; and it is the duty of the intelligent, the enlightened, to expose untruths, when speciously disguised. Superstition is based on ignorance, which is warred upon everywhere, as they conceive, except in churches, where, having gained sanctuary, it is to be allowed to remain unmolested. They have any number of pronounced radical views; some, doubtless, familiar to many, and others that are little known. Extreme as these views may seem to some persons, they are always, their holders claim, simply rationalistic and arrayed against superstition,—still the prevailing evil of the day, whether in politics, sociology, ethics, or cosmogony. Not a few of these views are reproduced in detail in this paper as those of the meliorists, who differ nearly as much in opinion and belief as in their mode of expression. Some meliorists who are the least communicative are the most radical in thought. They all agree, however, in respect of humanitarianism; joining hands and hearts as regards acts of benevolence and charity. One of their mottoes is, "Believe what you choose: do what you ought."

The German scholars and philosophers, especially since Kant and Mendelssohn (Moses), have made such exhaustive studies of theology and Biblical history, and have published so many volumes thereon, that their ideas and conclusions have, in a measure, become part of the stock of common knowledge, and of the mental atmosphere of the period. Not a few, like Schleiermacher, Strauss, Paulus, Bauer (Bruno), were theologians, and for years maintained their orthodoxy. Even Hegel never withdrew his nominal allegiance to Christianity; the right wing, as it is called, of his admiring adherents declaring that his views and those of orthodoxy were harmonious. Nevertheless German scholars have riddled Revelation; have completely overthrown all claim of the Scriptures to be regarded as the Word of God, and have subverted every dogma of what pretends to be the old Christianity. Hegel was really a pantheist, as most of his countrymen, outside of ecclesiasticism, are pantheists. Indeed, most contemporaneous thinkers at home and abroad are, too, including the bulk of meliorists; albeit they may not avow the fact, and some of them may be ignorant of it. It seems strange, inexplicable, perhaps, that any intelligent man should not know what his theological or religious belief

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is. But this condition is very common. It is, in truth, the rule rather than the exception. The belief of many men—that of the intellectual especially—changes with their feelings, with their moods, with their environment. They believe differently at ten o'clock in the morning from what they believe at two in the afternoon; differently then from what they will the next morning. Few men, whether orthodox or heterodox, are quite willing, and these seldom like, to tell their belief, even if they know it. It is generally considered impertinent, a sign of ill breeding, to ask any questions on the subject; and those questioned think themselves privileged to decline to answer.

Theological terms, too, are little understood. It might be supposed that Pantheism would be definite enough. But those who have been called Pantheists, as their printed writings have clearly indicated, have denied the charge as if it were discreditable. No wonder. Have not professed Christians pronounced pantheism, which is a prevalent belief among the most intellectual and scholarly, the worst form of atheism? Has not Spinoza, the leading pantheist of the seventeenth century, been called the God-intoxicated man, as well as the most dangerous, the most destructive of infidels? He says that the love of God extinguishes all other desires; that virtue is the knowledge and power of God in the human soul. The ethical principles in which his philosophy results were put forward by him as identical with those of Christianity. Goethe, ranked by all the Germans, and by a multitude of others, as the wisest of mortals, believed in Spinoza, and said that his works afforded him the greatest consolation. Emerson and Carlyle, who were very fond of talking of "being resolved into the Infinite," were pantheistic, in effect, like the majority of their guild. Many meliorists, as has been said, are essentially pantheists, who hold that everything is part of God; that human beings, in dying, return to the Godhead as the eternal principle, and are thus assured of immortality. The average orthodoxist cannot accept, cannot comprehend this. He demands a personal Deity, a reflection of himself; so that, instead of God making him, he makes God, after his own image. He must have, also, a conscious existence beyond the grave; cannot be content with reunion with the Primal Cause. Such abstractions are not for him, are not suited to his understanding.

Thus, it is plain why most meliorists are outside the evangelical pale, and why they are not approved generally by church communicants, many as there are of these included in the broader, more rational, more philosophic creed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No philosophy of Meliorism has been framed or even outlined: it is too broad, too elastic, too informal to be defined: it is all the better that it has not been. One of the few melioristic philosophers, so designated, was George Eliot, who is said to have invented the term for herself. She was constantly called a pessimist, or an infidel, neither of which has any significance, as commonly used. She did not believe the world all good or all evil, but an admixture of both. She was cheered by the conviction that it was gradually mending; not from any supernal cause, but from human efforts in behalf of humanity. The mass of meliorists are in accord with her, though many may take more into account the ever-operating law of Progress. As has been intimated, meliorists in general are completely rationalistic and practical. They look to secular, not to celestial, agencies for the government and regulation of this planet. And yet not a few of their number, as has been said, are outwardly orthodox, are even ministers of the Gospel,—excellent men, but not sound in what is ranked as sound theology.

Many ministers and theologians in America, as well as in Germany and other progressive countries, do not hold the tenets of their creed, while mute as to their dissent. Why should they not be mute? They are not sure, nor can anybody be sure, of what has not been experienced; and they may think, as many do, that some degree of supernatural belief is better than no belief. To speak of their doubts might unsettle others; and it is pleasant to cherish a comforting faith while one may. The New Criticism, as it is named, has created a revolution in Biblicism. The old religion is very unlike the new; and advanced thinkers have accepted the new. The present attitude of many of these is indifference to supernaturalism, about which nothing can be known. The ancient idea, that a man cannot be actually good, unless he admits the truth of religion (meaning theology), has long been abandoned. The modern opinion is, that he is neither better nor worse for such admission. Goodness depends entirely on what we do, or desire to do. We should be judged by our intention rather than by our accomplishment.

The meliorist is apt to be practical, to count deed far above creed, though, in many cases, not objecting to creed, if it does not affect conduct. At the same time, he, being usually a man of culture and studious habits, has investigated most subjects of importance, real or supposed; among others theology,—especially the doctrines it has inculcated. We owe to him deliverance from many superstitions,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which are always mischievous, to say the least. His cardinal conviction,—proved by history, records, and observation,—that the world is improving, even if gradually, is not in conformity with common understanding of the Bible, which seems to represent Man as inherently wicked, fallen, and unregenerate. The exact contrary is true. Man is naturally inclined to be good; and would remain so, measurably, but for bad influences and unfavorable surroundings. As to his fallen, unregenerate state,—that is a metaphysical fiction, expanded by the patristic writers, and made necessary for the sustainment of the Garden of Eden story, long since explained as an oriental fable.

The Bible is now accepted by most scholars as history and literature merely; but the early criticisms upon its incongruities and impossibilities were, in all likelihood, made by meliorists, not then so named. Meliorists regard courage, as Plato regards it, as one of the chief virtues, and deprecate, again with Plato, the fear of death. The Scriptures, the Fathers of the Church particularly, and theologians in general, have had the effect of elevating fear into a supreme moral excellence. Fear of death they always insist on as most exemplary. "Be mindful of death"; "Prepare for death"; "In the midst of life, we are in death," are among their innumerable mortuary presentments. They have rung all sorts of changes on the topic; and if they have not made it an overwhelming terror, it is not from any lack of diligence and energy on their part. "Fear the wrath of an angry God" is a familiar phrase, which fully comports with the spirit of the Old Testament, and tends to render the very idea of Deity repulsive. If God were an All-Wise, All-Perfect being, could He, asks the meliorist, be angry or wrathful? "Fear of God is the beginning of wisdom" is another Biblical announcement. We are continually hearing, even to this day, of God-fearing men; as if fearing God were a transcendent merit. Why should man fear God, if He be a loving, beneficent being, as is claimed? "We should fear Him because we love Him," has been theologically explained as, "We should fear to do wrong." We cannot love what we fear: fear and hate are as cause and effect. Fear is a miserable, cowardly, slavish passion. We should do our utmost to cure ourselves of it—it is natural to most of us—instead of cultivating it as a specific virtue.

Despite the efforts of theologians for ages, and of most clergymen until within the last thirty or forty years, to make death a bugbear, it has lost, if it ever had them, all its manufactured terrors. Physicians, hospital nurses, persons generally who have had abundant and constant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experience of scenes of death, tell us that death is not dreaded by the dying. These frequently want to live for their families, their friends, or for particular work which they are anxious to accomplish. But they seldom have apprehensions beyond the grave, which the patristic fathers were so lugubriously eloquent upon for centuries.

The dying are concerned with the things of this world, not with the shadows of the next. As death draws near to us, it ceases to have any of the formidable look it has worn at a distance. The painful accompaniments of the sick-chamber—the solemn hush, the sad faces of friends, the weeping eyes of women, the pitiful expression of children—are unavoidably distressing to see. But the prospect of the grave is not disturbing: it conveys to the weary mind only a sense of relief and rest. Very few persons, however unpleasant the concomitants of an exit from this earth, are frightened at the thought of being dead. How many of us think again and again, during life, of the comfort of being entirely out of life, of an end of it forever! Many of us are so tired of it that we want no more; we experience satisfaction—even joy, often—that our departure is at hand.

The majority of us relish life, while we are young, strong, healthful; in comfortable circumstances; our plans, our purposes unfulfilled. But when our youth has passed; when our future is behind us; when we have achieved failure, as the bulk of us do, the savor of the world is lost. Life is not precious in and of itself. It may be a burthen too heavy to be borne, as is evinced by the poor wretches who daily cast it off. It cannot be judged externally: only he to whom it belongs can appraise it. To call it a boon, as is the orthodox fashion, and to assume that anyone who is born should be eternally indebted to a Divine Power for his birth, is not reasonable. We are born and we die by a natural law, independent of our will, without our assent. Life is very frequently a bane: many, if not most, of us would not have accepted it, had we been consulted; presuming that we could have had any preconception of what it would prove. Why should we be grateful for something that is forced upon us, that frequently becomes a curse? Talk of the fear of death! We should have much more fear of life, if, before entering the world, we could have any presentment of its cares, its disappointments, its sorrows, its sufferings. With such pre-knowledge, who would have had courage enough to venture on so terrible an uncertainty? And yet we must regard life, forsooth, as a precious gift, though it is neither a gift nor precious! How grossly incongruous are many evangelical doctrines!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meliorists often ask for light on what is constantly spoken of as "our responsibility to Almighty God." Supposing, they say, that He is directly our Maker, we have never asked Him to make us, and may never have enjoyed our making. He is the creator of the universe and every form of existence. We are insignificant worms, —which surely we must be, compared with His omniscience and omnipotence. He is as much above and beyond us as we are above and beyond the invisible animalcules in a drop of water. They can have no more conception of us than we can have of Him. We are absolutely incomprehensible to the minor entities. They can no more be responsible to us—so immeasurable, so inconceivable is the distance between them and ourselves—than we can be responsible to Almighty God. If there were any responsibility, it would be on the other side. Having created us, as the Scriptures read, entirely for His own glory, —we having no will or voice in the event,—He should be accountable to us in every particular; not we to Him. Such accountability is more than impossible: it is unthinkable. But, rationalistically, there is not, and cannot be, responsibility on either side. The human being, who may be, as the adjective is applied, divine as well, is responsible to himself and to his fellows; perhaps, to his own ideal; but there the responsibility ends. Theological notions on the subject are but nebulous metaphysics, not worthy of serious consideration.

Were Meliorism a system, it would be somewhat akin to Hegel's "Philosophy of Nature," divested of its abstractions and subtleties. But Meliorism is concrete, intelligible, for the most part, secular. Its adherents, if they may be so named, might be ranged, like the French Chamber, and the disciples of Hegel divided into three wings. The right wing is composed of the nominally orthodox; the central wing, of those who act but do not discuss; and the left wing, of those who are hostile to whatever they think is tinctured with superstition, and who have a weakness for debate. The three wings, however, are united in love of and sympathy with humanity, in doing good under all circumstances, in practical Christianity. Much as they differ in some points of belief, they are without any abject fear of the known or the unknown. They are convinced that the eternal tendency—call it what one may—is to betterment, and that most of the betterment depends upon ourselves. The God in whom they all repose faith is within; is the subjective essence.

JUNIUS HENRI BROWNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATING.

In the past two or three years a wonderful revival of interest has taken place throughout the colleges of this country in public speaking and discussion. In the East, where the lack of interest had been particularly marked, this revival has been most evident; but it has also extended to the South and West. Two reasons, in the main, account for it. The repeated attacks which have been made on athletics have stimulated in college men a desire for ideals of a somewhat different character. And, on the other hand, a new kind of literary activity has arisen, which, possessing some of the best elements of sport, and at the same time enlisting the good-will of those who were most strenuous in their opposition to the prominence of athletics, has taken firm hold on undergraduate life: I mean, of course, intercollegiate debating.

The origin of intercollegiate debating is not difficult to trace. It arose in a natural reaction against the lax condition of the literary societies, and against the lack of genuine interest in any form of public speaking which for many years existed at Harvard and Yale, and, in fact, at almost all Eastern colleges. Many of the debating societies were old and well established; but the prominent place which they occupied during the early and middle years of the century was, as a rule, no longer theirs, and they were wholly out of sympathy with the new ideals of the modern college world. At the same time there were those who felt that such societies still had a definite and exceedingly valuable part to perform in college and university life and education, and who sought by various means to win back for them their former prestige and efficiency. No feasible plan for stimulating a revival of interest was, however, hit upon until the years 1889 and 1890, when some members of the Harvard Union, who entered college with the classes of 1892 and 1893 and who had had some experience in joint debates between preparatory schools in the vicinity of Boston, proposed to that society to hold debates with other colleges. For two years these men were voted down with considerable ridicule. In 1891, however, one of their number, Mr. F. W. Dallinger, now a senator in the Massachusetts legislature, took occasion, in replying to a letter from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secretary of the Yale Union, to set forth the advantages of a series of debates between Yale and Harvard. Nothing came of this proposal that year; but the following autumn, Yale sent a challenge for a joint discussion, and the opponents of the scheme in the Harvard Union having been graduated or won over, the proposal was at once accepted. Representatives of the two colleges met at Springfield and arranged for two debates, the first to take place at Cambridge on January 14, 1892.

On this day, therefore, Harvard and Yale met on the platform in the first of the modern intercollegiate debates. The question was, "*Resolved*, That a young man casting his first ballot in 1892 should vote for the nominees of the Democratic party." Yale had the affirmative. The late ex-Governor William E. Russell, of Massachusetts, acted as the presiding officer. Though, in accordance with the agreement, there were no judges, and consequently no formal decision was given as to which side proved itself superior in the contest, the meeting was very satisfactory; the audience was large, representative, and enthusiastic, and the debating creditable.

The second, the return debate, which was held at New Haven on March 25 following, had a still greater success. Dr. Chauncey M. Depew presided, and on the platform were many distinguished alumni of Yale. After the debate a new and interesting feature was added. The meeting was given a distinctly social turn by a banquet provided by the Yale literary societies in honor of the speakers. At the banquet Mr. Depew was toast-master, Prof. Hart, of Cambridge, responded for Harvard, and President Dwight for Yale. Other speakers were Prof. Hadley, the Hon. Francis Wayland, and Judge Howland of New York. Both by their presence and by what they said, these men emphasized the dignity and importance of the contests.

From 1893 to the present time the history of debating has been chiefly that of expansion. In the spring of that year, Yale received a challenge from the Whig and Cliosophic Societies of Princeton, and debated in Princeton on March 15. The next year Princeton made overtures to Harvard and Yale for permanent admission to their league. These were not acted upon immediately, but the following autumn Princeton was admitted, and the present triangular league established. In 1894–95 also, dual leagues were established between the University of Pennsylvania and Cornell and between Leland Stanford Jr. University and the University of California; and the University of Michigan debated with the University of Wisconsin and Northwestern University. Last year, Michigan debated with North-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

western University and with the University of Chicago, Boston University debated with Wesleyan University and with Bates College, and Williams and Dartmouth had their first meeting. Columbia also had completed all arrangements to debate with the University of Chicago when the latter college withdrew.

The mechanics of the debates—I speak now of the Harvard-Yale-Princeton league, for it is on this that the other leagues have for the most part been formed—are fortunately simple; and there has been little friction. Still, as from time to time questions have arisen that caused delay and considerable correspondence, it was thought best last year to get a definite statement from the colleges on several points. For this purpose, a conference, composed of a graduate and an undergraduate representative from each of the three colleges, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, was held at New Haven last May, and though the meeting had no final jurisdiction, much good was accomplished. It was then decided that, in the future, the debates should consist of three speeches of twelve minutes on each side and three speeches in rebuttal of five minutes on each side. The subject for the debate must be submitted by the home college at least seven weeks before the meeting is to take place; and the choice of sides, which is always the privilege of the visiting college, must be made within two weeks after the subject has been received. The list of judges, which is to contain the name of no graduate of either institution contesting, must be submitted by the home college at least six weeks before the debate, and must be returned by the visiting college, with any objection noted, within one week. The judges so chosen must decide upon the merits of the debate without regard to the merits of the question.

Formal rules, however, give one but little idea of what the debating activity of a college is under the present system of intercollegiate contests. It begins with the opening of the autumn term. The first matter to demand attention is usually the selection of a question. This task, which is by no means an easy one, falls to a joint committee of the debating societies of the college; or to a central organization, if there be one. Under the present system, in which the opposing college has the choice of sides, the first concern in selecting a question is that it shall have two equal, or nearly equal, sides. The question must also have an interest for the public, and it must be worth discussing. Such at least seem to have been the principles underlying the selection of topics in the past. Last year, for example, when the currency and the Venezuelan boundary dispute were the chief subjects

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of political interest, Harvard and Princeton debated the retiring of the greenbacks, and Harvard and Yale an international board of arbitration. Princeton and Yale discussed a topic of perhaps less immediate interest, but by no means an unimportant one,—referendum of State legislation. In preceding years, immigration, railroad pooling, protection and free trade, the annexation of Canada, party allegiance in politics, the Cabinet in Congress, labor organizations, and a property qualification for municipal suffrage have all been debated.

When the question has been selected and the sides chosen, the next step is the preliminary debate. In different colleges somewhat different methods are employed. At Yale and Princeton,—and this is the most common method,—each society, at a debate within its own hall, selects two or three men; a week or so later these men meet the representatives of the other societies at a debate at which the final selection is made by members of the faculty acting as judges. At Harvard, however, until the present year, a different method has been pursued. An open meeting has been held at which any member of the University could make a five-minute speech on the topic of the final debate; and on the basis of these speeches the men were chosen. To this plan, even in Cambridge, much objection has been made; and this year Harvard's representatives will be chosen in two preliminary contests, the first consisting of short speeches, open to all members of the University, and the second of a more formal debate between the ten or twelve men who have acquitted themselves most satisfactorily in the first. Judges, however, should not, and seldom do, base their decision entirely on the speeches of the preliminary debates; they usually take into consideration who the men are, how much experience in speaking they have had, how they stand in their courses, and, finally, their capacity for hard work. With these points and the speeches in mind, they select three regular debaters and one alternate speaker, and to these men the hard work, as well as the honor, falls.

On the day after the final preliminary contest the hard work begins. The debaters set about reading at once. They find little use in talking. From his preliminary work each man has derived a different idea as to how the question should be treated; and it is beyond his power to bring the others to his position. So the first thing is to get a common ground, and this can be had only by hard reading. Usually a bibliography of books, pamphlets, and articles is prepared, and divided among the debaters. Each man is instructed to look into everything on his list, to read what is pertinent, and to take notes and report to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the others all that has especial value. When this has been done, the general outlines of the question begin to be discussed. Next comes the making of the brief—in which each debater, since he may have to defend an attack on any part of it, must have a share—and the partition of the subject. The first part of the debate is usually given to a man who has a clear head for exposition and is a graceful speaker; he must get the question before the audience clearly and in such a way as to win their sympathy. To the second speaker is given the brunt of the argumentation; he presents the argument so far as time permits him. The last speech always goes to the best man, the most facile in rebuttal: he takes up that part of the argument which the second speaker has failed to touch upon, and in general strengthens the case wherever he can. After the divisions have been made, each man turns to the preparation of his own particular part. He determines the points he will bring up, the evidence he will introduce under each, and the order. He may write his speech out, and learn portions of it, or the brief may be the final form; this will depend on his method as a speaker. When the parts have been put into some kind of shape, a week or ten days before the contest, by far the most exhilarating part of the preparation begins,—the practice debates. Old debaters, graduate students, all men, in fact, who have any knowledge of the topic, and who are willing, are called in to speak against the contestants. Meetings are held every day, different assignments being made, although the old debaters are usually on hand each afternoon. The contestants speak in the order they are to have at the debate; while the outsiders take the place of the visiting team, and try to present such arguments as they will offer. There is also constant criticism by all present of the most unsparing kind. The least mis-statement, the slightest tendency to be dry or verbose or to miss a point, is caught up, and the attention of the speaker called to it. This is exasperating at first, almost discouraging; but it is salutary discipline. For, as a result, when the men go on to the platform for the debate, their knowledge of the question and the best way to state it is well-nigh perfect. They are masters of themselves and of their whole line of proof.

That the value of this training can be seriously doubted is difficult to understand. The merits of the debate itself—the give and take, the sharpening of wits, the demand for cool heads and keen minds—have long been appreciated. Intercollegiate debate, since it calls for these qualities in simply a greater degree, is only the more admirable. At no other time in his college course does a man have the oppor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tunity to work up a question so thoroughly and consistently. Not only must a great mass of facts and material be collected by the debater, but he must react on them in an original way. The power of selection and judgment is constantly called into service; how much to take and what to leave is an ever-perplexing problem. Of still greater value is the sense of responsibility engendered. On the debaters rests the making of the case, and to them the college looks. The practice in speaking, too, is excellent. As a rule the ideas of the college student are not set much store by; but on this one occasion, before an intelligent audience, and before a distinguished body of judges, he is expected to give, and he will be listened to while he does give, his most matured ideas. This, in addition to the practice of the trial debates, where a man speaks daily on a question which has his whole heart and soul, gives the student a grasp, a power, a capacity, which he does not acquire otherwise.

Perhaps as good a way as any to bring out the peculiar value of the training of the debates is by contrasting with it the methods of that other form of college speaking once so popular, and still in great favor in the South and West,—the oration. Suppose the same topic—for example, the recognition of Cuban belligerency—be chosen by a contestant in an oratorical contest and as the subject for an intercollegiate debate. The orator, since he must thrill his hearers, must bring out dramatic situations and effects. He dwells on the inhumanities of the present war, of which he gives two or three specific instances of a particularly glowing type; he dilates on the nearness of Cuba to our coasts, and insists that the brotherhood of man ought to bridge such a chasm; he shows that Cuba is fighting for liberty; he draws a parallel with our war for independence, for the success of which the aid of another nation was so essential; and he ends with a strong peroration on the mission of America in the Western world. He says nothing about belligerency; and he would think himself very foolish to clog his discourse with anything like evidence. How different is the method of the debater! Recognizing at the outset that he must grapple with his topic closely, and knowing that belligerency is a question of international law, he turns at once to Wheaton or Hall to find on what ground the recognition of belligerency rests. Then, by most painstaking research, he tries to ascertain the precise state of affairs in Cuba, and whether the conditions fulfil the requirements. Failing in this, or wishing to strengthen his case, he may have recourse to the same point of view as the orator, that of common humanity; but his treatment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be very different. He would endeavor to show how, in a general way, moral principles may, and sometimes should, outweigh legal precedents; citing perhaps in support of this proposition the Fugitive Slave Law. Then he would try to show that the condition in Cuba presents a moral situation which demands interference, in spite of any obligation to Spain or the rest of the world; to prove that the United States could interfere effectually,—that is, without making bad worse; and that interference would not involve annexation at a future time. But without pursuing the subject further, it may be left to the reader to decide which kind of training is best for the future editor or legislator. One thing only may be said: When a student has thus come to see the need of finding reasons for his ideas, of thinking long and laboriously before he begins to speak, it is not at all probable that in after life, when confronted with the same kind of questions, he will adopt different methods.

As is the case with most of the undertakings with which college men have to do, the system of intercollegiate debating is not wholly perfect. In particular, two faults have arisen against which a word of caution is necessary. The first of these is what is commonly known as faculty coaching. In the past year or two a tendency has developed, and it is to be feared that it is on the increase, for members of faculties to have an active part in the preparation of the debates. No college, it may be said at once, is alone at fault; the evil probably exists, to some extent, in all. But beyond any doubt it ought to be put an end to. If it continues, and members of the faculties submit to such procedure, the debates will degenerate into contests between the two boards of instruction, in which the speakers will be well-trained mouthpieces. Some kinds of assistance from faculties—suggestions about books, for instance—are unquestionably allowable; but when it comes to having any part whatsoever in the making of the speeches, the danger-line is passed. Those who are in charge of debating affairs in colleges, will, it is to be hoped, see this, and recognize the necessity of a decided stand on the right side.

The other danger, to which I wish simply to refer, is one still more indigenous to college affairs: the tendency to over-do. Not content with "'Varsity" debates, in the past two years Harvard and Yale have held freshman contests, and at the present time even preparatory schools are arranging debating leagues and associations. Of course, it must be admitted that this question is one on which sensible men may differ; and yet the arguments against the further extension of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system seem reasonably definitive. Freshmen—still more sub-freshmen—are incompetent to debate. The freshman has had none of the training essential for a debater; he has had no instruction in history, politics, or economics, no training in argumentation. He is a novice in knowledge and in skill, wholly unequal to the strain of prolonged and systematic thought on difficult subjects. To be sure, it may be said in reply to this argument that the freshman intercollegiate debates, particularly the last one, have been creditable affairs. But this seeming success really proves nothing at all; it simply shows that a freshman can learn to shoot well when he is properly loaded.

That these evils, however, will stay or even moderate the interest in intercollegiate debating cannot for a moment be admitted. The interest is too deep, too widespread. A victory in debate nowadays is received with little less enthusiasm than a victory on the field; and to the successful contestants is given academic distinction as gratifying as that accorded prominent writers or athletes. The West too, as well as the East, is awakened. Leland Stanford Jr. University and the University of California have annual debates, as well as Harvard and Yale; and during the present winter, between Boston and Berkeley scores of such meetings between colleges will be held. In no form of college activity is there more genuine enthusiasm, or a more auspicious outlook for a future of great usefulness.

RALPH CURTIS RINGWALT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED